Volume XXXVIII] *January, 1933* [*Number 2*

The

American Historical Review

VENETIAN SHIPPING DURING THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

IT is generally thought that dislocation of the spice trade by the Portuguese discovery of the Cape route to India crippled Venetian commerce. A study of Venetian shipping fails to justify that notion. The effects of the Portuguese discovery upon Venetian trade have frequently been misrepresented because of a failure to distinguish between long ships and round ships. In most discussions of Venetian commerce attention has been concentrated on the merchant galleys,[1] a type of long ship built especially for the transport of spices and other precious wares. But throughout both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries round sailing ships formed a larger part of the merchant marine. During these centuries the relative usefulness of the two types shifted, however, because of technical changes in rigging and armament. A recognition of the distinct economic functions of these different types of ships in the fifteenth century, and of their changed status in the sixteenth, is the key to the history of Venetian shipping in the period of the Commercial Revolution. When viewed as a whole the Venetian merchant marine employed in international commerce appears not to have declined, but actually to have grown in cargo-carrying capacity during the sixteenth century.

The differences between the large round ship and the long ship or galley were obvious to the eye.[2] Round ships were high and wide and dependent entirely on sails; long ships were low and narrow and equipped with oars. Round ships were built for stability and for heavy cargoes; long ships for speed and for fighting. The round ship was primarily a merchantman, the long ship was primarily a warship, and

[1] For example, Alethea Wiel, *The Navy of Venice* (London, 1910), pp. 314 ff.

[2] Detailed descriptions of the variations of both types are given by Enrico Alberto d'Albertis, Le Costruzioni Navali e l'Arte della Navigazione al Tempo di Cristoforo Colombo, in *Raccolta di Documenti e Studi pub. dalla R. Commissione Colombiana* (Rome, 1893), vol. I., pt. 4; by John Forsyth Meigs, *The Story of the Seaman* (London, Philadelphia, 1924); and by A. Jal, *Archéologie Navale* (Paris, 1840).

although some round ships were built especially for war, and some long ships were designed for trade, yet even so their functions were distinct in commerce and in war. The long ship designed for trade carried light precious cargoes, the round ship heavy cargoes.

The organization of the maritime trade of Venice in the fifteenth century was based on this difference in the commercial functions of the two types. A monopoly of the transport of spices and some other light wares from the Levant to Venice had been given by law to the great galleys, a special type of long ship.[3] Voyages by these ships westward were organized for exporting spices and other precious merchandise. Besides the well-known "Flemish" galleys, which later did at least as much business in England as in Flanders and called at Lisbon and various Mediterranean ports, there were two other fleets of great merchant galleys sent westward. The galleys of Aigues-Mortes served the northern shore of the western Mediterranean, the galleys of Barbary visited its southern shore, and both fleets called at Sicilian and Spanish ports.[4]

These great galleys or merchant galleys were not particularly large vessels compared to many of the Venetian round ships of the time. They carried between 140 and 250 deadweight tons of cargo below deck.[5]

[3] Archivio di Stato di Venezia (cited hereafter as A. S. V.), Ufficiali al Cattaver, busta 1, cap. 1, ff. 65–72. These regulations proceeded from the principle that "light goods" could be brought to Venice from the Levant only by "armed ships", later interpreted to mean the great galleys, the merchant galleys of the state. Exemptions were then made for specific wares and specific times although many wares permitted to come on "unarmed ships" (round ships) were obliged to pay freight to the galleys. But spices, even if loaded in the Levant by other ships, could not complete the transit to Venice, between 1435 and 1514, except in the merchant galleys, or, if the galleys were filled, in a selected ship which traveled with the galleys under the same command to carry the surplus. Such ships, when their cargo is mentioned, carried but a negligible amount. See references below on spice imports, and A. S. V., Senato Misti, reg. 47, ff. 19, 128; reg. 48, ff. 12–13; reg. 52, f. 14; reg. 57, f. 134; Ufficiali al Cattaver, busta 2, cap. 4, f. 25; A. S. V., Senato Mar., reg. 18, f. 29; Arsenale, busta 8, ff. 2–3; Marino Sanuto, *I Diarii*, 58 vols. (Venice, 1879–1903), vol. XVIII., col. 178; vol. XXXVI., col. 382.

[4] The west-bound galleys were obliged to load all the spices and other light goods offered before they could load heavy goods such as wine. See Senato Misti, reg. 47, f. 106; reg. 49, ff. 81–84, 86, 91; reg. 54, ff. 68–69.

[5] In 1440 the galleys of the measure of Flanders, those used on most of the voyages, were forbidden to be over 440 *milliarii*. Senato Misti, reg. 60, f. 249. One *milliarius* = .47 deadweight tons. In 1481 they were forbidden to be over 450 *milliarii*. A. S. V., Senato Terra, reg. 8, f. 114. These limitations were fixed in order to check the tendency of the shipwrights to enlarge the galleys up to 500 or 600 *milliarii*. A computation at the bottom of the page, Senato Terra, reg. 3, f. 75, in 1452, shows that at that time the merchant who rented the galley from the state for the voyage was expected to collect freight on 430 *milliarii*. The galleys of the measure of Romania were legally of but 140 to 165 tons burden. Senato Mar., reg. 1, f. 13.

Though smaller they were considered safer than the round ships because in addition to the sails on which they relied during most of the voyage the galleys had oars to use in entering and leaving ports. Moreover they were warships with crews of over 200 men armed as the Signoria might direct and commanded by a noble whom it selected.[6]

But the bulk of the Venetian merchant marine was composed of round ships. In the proverbial golden age of Venice, roughly from 1420 to 1450, she had 300 such ships of 100 deadweight tons or more.[7] Most of these 300 were probably used for fishing or for carrying about the Adriatic such humble cargoes as grain, oil, wood, and stone, and did not figure as long distance carriers on the great routes of interregional trade. But it may be estimated that at least thirty to thirty-five of them were ships of 240 tons or more and were habitually used on voyages beyond the Adriatic, mainly on the longest well-established voyages such as those to England, Syria, and the Crimea.[8] They were the great merchantmen of their day, distinct in rigging and in structure from the coasting vessels.[9]

[6] For the large crew, see Senato Misti, reg. 49, ff. 114–115. Details of the armament, the military command, the ports of call, the freight rates, etc., were determined for each voyage by the terms of the resolutions under which the galleys were auctioned. For the years before 1440 these resolutions are contained in the series Senato Misti, for 1440–1469 in Senato Mar., and after 1469 in a special series called Senato, Deliberazione, Incanti Galere, which comes down to 1569. In this last series the years 1499–1519 are missing but the diary of Marino Sanuto does much to fill the gap.

[7] This figure is given both in Senato Mar., reg. 15, f. 145 (1502), where the records of the Consoli dei Mercanti are referred to as the source of information, and in the "Death-bed Oration" of Doge Tommaso Mocenigo of which the most convenient edition is in Heinrich Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig* (Gotha, 1905, 1920), II. 617. The figures in Mocenigo's oration are the subject of some dispute, but the plausibility of those concerning shipping may be independently established, if not as in this case confirmed, and the financial figures have been supported by independent evidence by Gino Luzzato, Sull'Attendibilità di alcune Statistiche Economiche Medievale, in the *Giornale degli Economisti*, anno XLIV., no. 3, p. 126. For the ratios of conversion of weights and measures used here, see the dissertation by the author deposited in the Harvard College Library, "Venetian Ships and Shipbuilders of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries".

[8] The estimate "thirty to thirty-five" is obtained by extension of the ratio found to exist in Table B below. Table B gives a comparison of the number of ships employed on three fairly representative voyages about 1448–1449 and in 1558–1560. The total numbers employed on the three voyages were eighteen at the earlier date and twenty at the later date. The total number of ships of the type here considered was at the later date forty (see below). The assumption is that, if "x" equals the number of such ships about 1448–1449, then 18:20 as x:40. The result, thirty-six, has been modified in consideration of the probably greater importation of grain at the later date in view of the increase in the population of Venice. Giulio Beloch, La Popolazione di Venezia nei Secoli XVI. e XVII., in *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, n. ser., anno II., t. III., pp. 1–49.

[9] Albertis, *op. cit.* Throughout the following discussion of round ships and their voyages the assumption is made that ships of 240 tons, or more, predominated in the

They traveled much the same routes as the merchant galleys but with different cargoes—cotton and alum from Syria, wine from Crete to England, slaves and foodstuffs from the Black Sea, and grain, oil, and salt between various Mediterranean ports.[10]

In the volume of cargo they carried the thirty to thirty-five great round ships were a much more important part of the merchant marine in the fifteenth century than were the eighteen or twenty merchant galleys which annually sailed at that time. Thirty-five round ships would have carried about 15,000 tons of cargo[11] and twenty merchant galleys

Venetian carrying trade outside the Adriatic, and that the number of such ships—in the whole merchant marine or employed on a particular voyage discussed—is an index of the volume of trade. The exact figure, 240 tons, is dictated by the sources, especially the ship lists of 1558–1560 cited below, and the assumption implies a more common use of large ships at that time than might be expected. But in the case of Venice some distinction is necessary between local and international shipping, and the following considerations support the assumption. The size of ship profitable on a particular voyage depends upon the length of the voyage and the volume of goods moved in that trade. Besides the specialization in rigging and shape which then existed in the Mediterranean between merchantmen for long voyages and for coasting voyages, specialization in size is to be expected. Such specialization was encouraged if not dictated by the Venetian government. It forbade ships of less than 240 tons to load salt at Cyprus (Senato Mar., reg. 13, f. 24; reg. 15, f. 145). When ships of the Adriatic or coasting type began to trade beyond the Adriatic they were forbidden to do so. Senato Mar., reg. 9, f. 19; law of August 13, 1602, printed in *Parti prese nell'Eccellentissimo Conseglio di Pregadi; con diversi Leggi cavate dal Statuto in Materia de Navi e sua Navigatione* (Venice, n. d.). That such specialization existed in practice appears from the fact that out of 135 ships mentioned in ship lists in the Notatorio di Collegio (A. S. V.) nos. 5–11, 1384–1457, as going or intending to go from Venice to Syria, the Crimea, or Alexandria, 129 were of 240 tons, or more, four have no sizes given, and only two, and two that did not go, are given as less than 240 tons. To be sure, out of the 135 ships, 100 were applicants for the Syrian voyage. Concerning the voyage to England, it is clear that ships well over 240 tons were considered necessary for the voyage. Senato Mar., reg. 9, f. 162; reg. 12, ff. 156–157; reg. 13, f. 27.

[10] Cotton and alum, Senato Misti, reg. 55, f. 181. Oil, fruit, soap, *ibid.*, reg. 57, f. 244; Senato Terra, reg. 10, f. 170. Wine, Senato Mar., reg. 9, f. 162 and below. Grain, Senato Misti, reg. 55, f. 184; Senato Mar., reg. 4, f. 19. Salt, Senato Misti, reg. 54, f. 37; Senato Mar., reg. 6, f. 27. Black Sea trade, Senato Misti, reg. 54, f. 102. The transport of slaves on merchant galleys was forbidden, *ibid.*, reg. 49, f. 114.

[11] If the estimate of the capacity of the round ships was made on the same basis as was the estimate of their number the result would be about 14,000 tons. But another method is available, for in ship lists in the Notatorio di Collegio, no. 10, between Jan., 1449, and April, 1450 inclusive, there is mention of twenty-one different ships with a total capacity of 10,153 tons. The lists in the Notatorio do not include all ships of any given class, but are merely lists of ships applying to serve against pirates or to take part in the Syrian voyage. The figure twenty-one does not, therefore, indicate the full number of ships of 240 tons or more. Instead, the number of such ships is better estimated as thirty to thirty-five, as explained above. Hence the total capacity may be calculated by adding to the known capacity of the twenty-one ships that of nine to fourteen additional ships, estimated, on the basis of those known and with due allowances, as 360 tons each. The result is 13,393 to 15,193 tons.

about 4500 tons. Such a comparison serves the purpose of placing the merchant galley fleets in proper perspective as but a small part of the fleets of Venice trading outside the Adriatic. In the shipping industry the galleys were of secondary importance. But they were of primary importance in the maintenance of Venice as the leading "world market" of the fifteenth century. They consistently carried more precious cargoes than other ships so that a comparison on the basis of value instead of capacity would yield quite different results. Moreover, their average total burden was well over 250 tons since besides the cargo in the hold they carried on deck a very large crew[12] and a number of passengers. Both crew and passengers were allowed to keep with them some personal possessions among which they found place for a certain amount of salable wares, so that the total weight of persons, equipment, and goods carried on deck was probably as great as that below deck.[13]

These two distinct types of Venetian merchantmen, great galleys and round ships, were products of distinct branches of the shipbuilding industry. The great galleys were built by the state in the arsenal. The round ships of commerce were built by private enterprise in private shipyards. When at the end of the fifteenth century the state felt it necessary to build round ships the government resorted to private shipyards. But in the main the production of round ships is synonymous with private shipbuilding.

After 1460 the two parts of the shipbuilding industry and of the merchant marine thus distinguished had different and frequently contrasting histories. The latter part of the fifteenth century was the period when the galley voyages were most numerous and regular and when this branch of the Venetian merchant marine was at the height of its fame. During that same period the fleet of large round ships was reduced to half its former size. In the first half of the sixteenth century, on the other hand, the merchant galley fleets dwindled and almost disappeared, but the large round ships increased in number so that in 1560 they were certainly larger and probably more numerous than they had ever been.

The decline of private shipbuilding at Venice was most severe between 1463 and 1488. By 1487 building was completely at a standstill.[14]

[12] In 1412 the size of the crew from commander to cook was legally fixed as 212. Senato Misti, reg. 49, ff. 114–115.

[13] The resolutions for auctioning the galleys are full of rules to stop overloading on deck. A description of the great galleys in 1501, quoted by Jal, I. 384–387, said that they carried 500 *milliarii* below deck and 500 *milliarii* on deck. The average size of the galleys increased somewhat during the fifteenth century because the smaller type gradually went out of use.

[14] Senato Mar., reg. 9, f. 19; reg. 12, ff. 125, 187.

The mental habits of the political historian may lead him to associate this decline with the naval advance of the Ottoman Turks, but the Venetians themselves, much as they were impressed with the political and military importance of that new danger in the East, did not consider it the cause of the weakening of their merchant marine. Instead they blamed nearby competitors better supplied with materials.

The building of smaller craft was the first part of the industry affected. River barges and small boats were built in Venetian possessions in Italy and brought to Venice for sale.[15] As the forests which had once surrounded the lagoons disappeared, the barge builders pursued them back towards the mountains.

The major rôle in this sudden depression of the Venetian industry was played by the eastern shore of the Adriatic. The great outcry against competing ships in the years 1467 and 1469 was directed against a particular type called "marani" most of which were built in Istria. They had become so numerous that it was impracticable for the state to dispense at once with the use of such ships in sending supplies, but they disposed of the competition of Istria in the future by forbidding the building of any ship of sixty tons or more between Venice and the Gulf of Quarnero.[16]

The center of competition then moved down the Adriatic. The bitterest protests were raised against the Ragusans who were at that time gaining a leading place in the Mediterranean carrying trade. The multiplication of Ragusan ships was attributed by the Venetians to the plentiful supply of wood, iron, and sailors available at Ragusa. To meet the situation the senate levied an anchorage tax of 100 ducats on Ragusan ships visiting any port under Venetian dominion. Well might the chronicler Malipiero say that Ragusan ships had been banned from Venice.[17] Later exemption was made of grain ships since the need for food was paramount.[18] But the exclusion from Venetian trade of ships flying the Ragusan flag, even if it could be achieved, would not revive the home industry. The advantages of building in Dalmatia were the root of the trouble. Venetians bought Ragusan ships and built their own ships there or in the Venetian possessions in Dalmatia. By various subterfuges Ragusans acquired citizenship in the Venetian cities of Dalmatia

[15] Senato Misti, reg. 47, f. 151; reg. 54, f. 5; reg. 59, f. 134; Arsenale, busta 6, ff. 13–15.

[16] Senato Mar., reg. 8, f. 144; reg. 9, ff. 19, 21, 136, 146, 157, 170.

[17] *Ibid.*, reg. 12 f. 21. Domenico Malipiero, Annali Veneti, in *Archivio Storico Italiano* (Florence, 1843), ser. 1, vol. VII., pt. 2, p. 620.

[18] Senato Mar., reg. 16, f. 57.

and kept up business under the flag of San Marco. Between 1487 and 1490 the senate was active putting teeth in old laws forbidding such practices, and in passing new measures to meet the wiles of the Ragusans. The senate even went so far as to forbid the building of any ship of thirty tons or more in Venetian Dalmatia, but the protests of their Dalmatian subjects secured the modification of this provision. In their final form these regulations were designed to permit the Dalmatians to continue to build the ships they needed for their Adriatic voyages, but to sever the Dalmatian industry from any connection with Venetian capital, and to cut it off entirely from any association with the Ragusans.[19]

Besides the competition of the inland barge builders and that of the Istrian and Dalmatian coasts, the Venetian shipbuilders suffered from the rivalry of more distant regions. Ships from Genoa, Portugal, the Basque country, and even England were competing with theirs on the long voyages which had been the chief support of the very largest Venetian ships, those of from 600 to 700 tons. Ships of that size were of special importance to the state because of their utility as naval auxiliaries and supply ships, and the rise of the Ottoman navy made the need of them all the more acute. Consequently, when offers of loans and increased freight rates failed to induce private citizens to build ships of the desired size, the Signoria was forced to build its own.[20] Between 1475 and 1488 the state built four ships ranging from 600 to 2400 tons, and between 1488 and 1498 ordered six, of which at least five were built, most of them of 1200 tons.[21] Thus the state obtained the large ships needed to strengthen her war fleet, hunt pirates, send supplies, and, if necessary, import grain and salt.

Meanwhile desperate efforts had been made to recapture from the competitors of Venice the transport of wine from Crete to England and since 1488 there had been some increase in the number of large private ships.[22] Ships lists of 1499 suggest that the fleet of private ships of 240

[19] *Ibid.*, reg. 12 ff. 125, 148, 187; reg. 13, ff. 3–7, 15.

[20] *Ibid.*, reg. 9, ff. 20, 99, 120–121, 162; Arsenale, busta 6, f. 10. There were no private Venetian ships of 600 tons or more in 1486 and 1488. Senato Mar., reg. 12, ff. 87, 157.

[21] Senato Terra, reg. 7, ff. 98–100, 139–140, 145, 157, 161, 177, 179, 192; reg. 8, f. 74; Senato Mar., reg. 10, ff. 155, 189; reg. 11, f. 103; reg. 12, ff. 123, 153; reg. 13, ff. 50, 90; reg. 14, f. 141; Malipiero, p. 645; Sanuto, I. 849–850; II. 1241–1249; IV. 51.

[22] On the Anglo-Venetian quarrel over the Cretan wine trade, see *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, edited by Rawdon Brown (London, 1864–), I. 175 ff., and Georg von Schanz, *Englische Handelspolitik gegen Ende des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1881), I. 130–142. A Venetian tax on foreigners exporting wine from Crete was to some extent successful in stimulating the building of large ships. There is mention of six ships of 600 tons or more between 1488 and 1497 in Sanuto, I. 81, 504, and Senato Mar., reg. 12, 13, and 14.

tons or more then totaled about 10,000 tons in twenty-five ships.[23] The four round ships of the state afloat in 1499 had a total capacity of 5100 tons. But these state ships only occasionally acted as merchantmen. Moreover it was only an extraordinary effort which kept so much shipping afloat that year. During the war with Turkey from 1499 to 1502 the attempt to control the Cretan wine trade had to be abandoned. In 1502 it was reported that there were but sixteen Venetian ships of the type used on long voyages, namely, of 240 tons or more.[24]

The second half of the fifteenth century, considered as a whole, was, accordingly, a period of decline of Venetian shipping. At this time when the wealth of Venice was the envy of all Christendom there was a weakening of the maritime activity by which the republic had risen to splendor. The brief revival of shipbuilding in the years just before 1499 was of an artificial character. The years 1488 and 1502 represented the double bottom of a prolonged depression. The stagnation of building was such that during those years, both in number and in capacity, the Venetian round ships adapted to trade beyond the Adriatic were not more than half what they had been in the middle of the century. The loss of smaller ships was likewise severe.[25] The merchant galleys sailed their yearly rounds with admired regularity, but there was no increase in their number to compensate for the losses elsewhere.

The turn of the tide came in 1502. Then occurred the most thoroughgoing and most successful of the many attempts to aid the shipbuilders. The shipowners' own views of their troubles were set forth at length in the preamble to the remedial law of 1502. They complained of the low freight rates secured by shippers, the innumerable dues and obligations laid on the ships by the state, the loss of the western trade because of the permission given to foreigners to load in Crete, the restrictions on carrying salt and grain between different ports in the western Mediterranean, and the competition of the Basque, Portuguese, and Spanish, who, they said, had earlier never come within the Straits of Gibraltar. The situation was met by restoring to private ships complete freedom to load all

[23] Lists in Sanuto, II. 1080–1081, 1242–1249, and in the manuscript copy of the *Diarii* in the Biblioteca Marciana, Venice, MSS. It., Cl. VII. 230, ff. 418, 481–483. There are two mistakes in the printing. The comprehensiveness of the lists is indicated by records concerning the mobilization of the merchant fleet, Sanuto, I. 780, 923; II. 629, 784, 919; Senato Mar., reg. 14, f. 196. The lists present difficulties of interpretation, but the results may be taken in conjunction with the general statements of the time, like those quoted in the text and that in Sanuto, II. 225, that in 1498 there were but twelve Venetian ships of 300 tons or more.

[24] Senato Mar., reg. 14, f. 181; reg. 15, f. 145.

[25] *Ibid.*, reg. 12, f. 125; reg. 15, f. 145; A. S. V., Cinque Savii alla Mercanzia, ser. 1, busta 135, ff. 99–100.

cargoes including salt and grain but excluding three special classes—goods forbidden by the Church, goods reserved for the galleys, and Moorish merchants and their wares. The dues laid upon the ships by the state were lessened. The senate approved a schedule of minimum freight rates, made provision for their prompt payment, and offered generous bounties to builders of new ships.[26]

So great was the revival in the building of round ships following the passage of this law that in 1507 the bounties were suspended as no longer necessary and too great a burden on the finances of the state.[27] Not only were a good number of large ships being built, but half of the seven in process of construction were of the very biggest type in commercial use.[28]

These years of prosperity for the private shipbuilders, 1502–1507, were precisely the years when the discovery of the route to India around the Cape of Good Hope was having its effect on the Levant trade of Venice. But that discovery affected only the cargoes of the galleys, not those of the round ships. It is even likely that the discovery of new routes to the East and West Indies was a distinct help to the private shipbuilders of Venice. The Portuguese and Spanish ships had been entering the Mediterranean and taking cargoes away from the Venetians. Now they had new seas to sail. Therefore, from the point of view of the largest part of the Venetian merchant marine, the round ship, the years following the great discoveries were years of expansion. To be sure, this prosperity was not maintained without interruption. Complaints of the lack of a sufficient number of ships occur from time to time and between 1534 and 1540 the freight rates on salt were raised and offers of loans were made to encourage building.[29] But in the years 1540–1570 there is no sign of depression, but instead positive evidence that the number of large round ships had doubled since the beginning of the century. Only the other branch of the merchant marine, the great galley fleets, can then have been adversely affected by the discovery of the new sailing routes.

In the detailed story of the disruption and practical disappearance of the voyages of the merchant galleys, quarrels with the sultan of Egypt and diplomatic and naval difficulties elsewhere bulk large,[30] but it is generally agreed that these were but incidental circumstances and that

[26] Senato Mar., reg. 15, f. 145.

[27] *Ibid.*, reg. 16, f. 152. A list of the large ships built or building in 1504 is given in Sanuto, V. 1000.

[28] List given in A. S. V., Notatorio di Collegio, no. 27, under date July 5, 1507.

[29] Gino Luzzato, Per la Storia delle Costruzioni Navali a Venezia nei Secoli XV. e XVI., in *Scritti Storici in Onore di Camillo Manfroni* (Padua, 1925), pp. 381–401.

[30] Wilhelm von Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen Age* (Leipzig, 1886), II. 508–552, and innumerable references in Sanuto, *op. cit.*

the determining factors lay deeper. Three such determining factors may be mentioned—the revolutionary improvements in the rigging of the round ship, the development of guns, and the discovery of the Cape route to India. Of these three the last only has usually been emphasized to the complete neglect of the others.

The nature and extent of the influence of the Portuguese route are shown by the rough statistics of the spice trade contained in the diaries of the Venetians Sanuto and Priuli, and in the reports of Ca' Masser the secret observer of the Signoria in Portugal. Before the discoveries, about half of the galleys which left Venice each year went to the Levant. In the return cargo of these nine or ten galleys spices formed the largest item, and in the last years of the fifteenth century they brought back about 3,500,000 English pounds of spices a year, of which about 2,500,000 pounds came from Alexandria, and of which forty to fifty per cent. was pepper.[31] The commercial effects of the discovery of the Cape route to India were first felt in the Levant in 1502. In the four years 1502–1505 the Venetians imported on an average not more than 1,000,000 pounds of spices a year.[32] The first large cargoes arrived in Portugal in 1503, and in the four years 1503–1506 the Portuguese imported an average of about 2,300,000 pounds a year of which eighty-eight per cent. was pepper.[33] The average yearly import of the two countries combined was at this time,

[31] Estimate based on the following figures from Sanuto, II. 112, 128, 165, 172; IV. 38–39, 47; *I Diarii di Girolamo Priuli, 1494–1512,* published in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores,* 2nd ed., vol. XXIV., pt. 3 (Città di Castello, 1911), vol. I., pp. 73, 109.

1497	galleys of Beirut	spice cargo	2639 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	spice cargo	2320 colli, corrected from 4320
	galleys of Alexandria	pepper	1250 colli
1498	galleys of Beirut	spice cargo	3000 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	spice cargo	2155 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	pepper	933 colli
1501	galleys of Beirut	spice cargo	3200 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	spice cargo	2570 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	pepper	950 colli

The war with Turkey prevented galleys completing voyages in 1499 and 1501 and during those years non-Venetians exported more spices than usual from Egypt, Sanuto, III. 37, 942; IV. 6–10.

The *collo* of Alexandria equalled about 1120 lbs., *ibid.,* XVII. 191. For the bales on the Beirut galleys *colli* and *sacho* are used interchangeably by Priuli, see Rinaldo Fulin. *Diarii e Diaristi Veneziani* (Venice, 1881), p. 247. This bale has been considered equal to 290 lbs., although some may have been larger. Sanuto, *loc. cit.;* Senato Mar., reg. 12, f. 136; reg. 56, f. 109.

[32] Sanuto, IV. 260–265; V. 78, 826–828, 902; VI. 129; Fulin, pp. 165–182.

[33] Leonardo da Ca' Masser, Relazione sopra il Commercio dei Portoghesi nell'India, 1497–1506, in *Archivio Storico Italiano, Appendice* (Florence, 1845), II., 13 ff. Previous Portuguese imports had been only 224,000 lbs., in 1501, and 173,000 lbs. in 1502.

therefore, a little less than the total Venetian imports before the discoveries—a comparison which suggests that for the first few years at least the Portuguese were more successful in disorganizing the Alexandrian spice market than in supplying the needs of Europe. In 1505 a dispute between the Venetians and the sultan of Egypt over the price of pepper led to the astounding escape of the Venetian galleys under the fire of the forts of Alexandria and the severance of relations for some years. From the resumption of trade in 1508 until 1514 the Venetian spice imports from Alexandria remained only a quarter of what they had been and pepper became a distinctly minor item in the cargo lists.[34] Trade with Beirut was less interrupted, according to Sanuto, but was likewise below its former volume.

After 1514 the records of the galley voyages no longer give accurate indexes of the amount of spices reaching Venice, for in that year the galleys lost their monopoly of the transport of spices. The round ships were then permitted to load spices in Alexandria for Venice, and when, in 1524, the galleys brought back no spices it was because the round ship *Cornera* had taken them all, and the galleys loaded linen and wheat instead, wares usually carried by round ships. After 1514 Venetian policy wavered. Some spices were brought by round ships, and galleys were sometimes sent instead, or in addition, until 1570.[35] A surprising index of the size of the spice trade at Alexandria in these years is contained in a loose sheet in the archives of the Donà della Rosa family. This document purports to be a copy from the books of the Venetian colony in Alexandria of the amount of pepper sent from Alexandria in the years 1560–1564, inclusive. It shows an annual export of 1,310,454 pounds of pepper from Alexandria alone, or fully as much pepper as in the period before the Portuguese had entered the spice trade.[36] Uncorroborated this

[34] Sanuto, VI. 156–157, 170, 199–207. Cargoes reaching Venice from Alexandria are recorded as follows:

1508, 1100 colli, *ibid.*, VII. 591, 597.

1509, none returned.

1510, 1000 colli, *ibid.*, X. 799, XI. 57, 69; Fulin, p. 209.

1511, none returned.

1512, 1180 colli, Sanuto, XIV. 25–26.

1513, 300 colli, *ibid.*, XVI. 177, 209.

[35] Sanuto, XVIII. 178; XXXV. 254, 332, 337; XXXVI. 382; Senato Mar., reg. 18, f. 29; Arsenale, busta 8, ff. 2–3, busta 9, f. 37; Senato Deliberazione, Incanti Galere, reg. 2, libri iv and v.

[36] Museo Civico, Venice, Archivio Donà della Rosa, busta 217, f. 276. The authenticity of documents in this bundle is discussed in the note to Table A. The figures are given first in "colli e nichesse" and then in "cantara". The figure given above is computed from the number of "cantara" assuming they were the *cantara forfori*, the measure used

the determining factors lay deeper. Three such determining factors may be mentioned—the revolutionary improvements in the rigging of the round ship, the development of guns, and the discovery of the Cape route to India. Of these three the last only has usually been emphasized to the complete neglect of the others.

The nature and extent of the influence of the Portuguese route are shown by the rough statistics of the spice trade contained in the diaries of the Venetians Sanuto and Priuli, and in the reports of Ca' Masser the secret observer of the Signoria in Portugal. Before the discoveries, about half of the galleys which left Venice each year went to the Levant. In the return cargo of these nine or ten galleys spices formed the largest item, and in the last years of the fifteenth century they brought back about 3,500,000 English pounds of spices a year, of which about 2,500,000 pounds came from Alexandria, and of which forty to fifty per cent. was pepper.[31] The commercial effects of the discovery of the Cape route to India were first felt in the Levant in 1502. In the four years 1502–1505 the Venetians imported on an average not more than 1,000,000 pounds of spices a year.[32] The first large cargoes arrived in Portugal in 1503, and in the four years 1503–1506 the Portuguese imported an average of about 2,300,000 pounds a year of which eighty-eight per cent. was pepper.[33] The average yearly import of the two countries combined was at this time,

[31] Estimate based on the following figures from Sanuto, II. 112, 128, 165, 172; IV. 38–39, 47; *I Diarii di Girolamo Priuli, 1494–1512,* published in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores,* 2nd ed., vol. XXIV., pt. 3 (Città di Castello, 1911), vol. I., pp. 73, 109.

1497	galleys of Beirut	spice cargo	2639 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	spice cargo	2320 colli, corrected from 4320
	galleys of Alexandria	pepper	1250 colli
1498	galleys of Beirut	spice cargo	3000 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	spice cargo	2155 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	pepper	933 colli
1501	galleys of Beirut	spice cargo	3200 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	spice cargo	2570 colli
	galleys of Alexandria	pepper	950 colli

The war with Turkey prevented galleys completing voyages in 1499 and 1501 and during those years non-Venetians exported more spices than usual from Egypt, Sanuto, III. 37, 942; IV. 6–10.

The *collo* of Alexandria equalled about 1120 lbs., *ibid.,* XVII. 191. For the bales on the Beirut galleys *colli* and *sacho* are used interchangeably by Priuli, see Rinaldo Fulin. *Diarii e Diaristi Veneziani* (Venice, 1881), p. 247. This bale has been considered equal to 290 lbs., although some may have been larger. Sanuto, *loc. cit.;* Senato Mar., reg. 12, f. 136; reg. 56, f. 109.

[32] Sanuto, IV. 260–265; V. 78, 826–828, 902; VI. 129; Fulin, pp. 165–182.

[33] Leonardo da Ca' Masser, Relazione sopra il Commercio dei Portoghesi nell'India, 1497–1506, in *Archivio Storico Italiano, Appendice* (Florence, 1845), II., 13 ff. Previous Portuguese imports had been only 224,000 lbs., in 1501, and 173,000 lbs. in 1502.

therefore, a little less than the total Venetian imports before the discoveries—a comparison which suggests that for the first few years at least the Portuguese were more successful in disorganizing the Alexandrian spice market than in supplying the needs of Europe. In 1505 a dispute between the Venetians and the sultan of Egypt over the price of pepper led to the astounding escape of the Venetian galleys under the fire of the forts of Alexandria and the severance of relations for some years. From the resumption of trade in 1508 until 1514 the Venetian spice imports from Alexandria remained only a quarter of what they had been and pepper became a distinctly minor item in the cargo lists.[34] Trade with Beirut was less interrupted, according to Sanuto, but was likewise below its former volume.

After 1514 the records of the galley voyages no longer give accurate indexes of the amount of spices reaching Venice, for in that year the galleys lost their monopoly of the transport of spices. The round ships were then permitted to load spices in Alexandria for Venice, and when, in 1524, the galleys brought back no spices it was because the round ship *Cornera* had taken them all, and the galleys loaded linen and wheat instead, wares usually carried by round ships. After 1514 Venetian policy wavered. Some spices were brought by round ships, and galleys were sometimes sent instead, or in addition, until 1570.[35] A surprising index of the size of the spice trade at Alexandria in these years is contained in a loose sheet in the archives of the Donà della Rosa family. This document purports to be a copy from the books of the Venetian colony in Alexandria of the amount of pepper sent from Alexandria in the years 1560–1564, inclusive. It shows an annual export of 1,310,454 pounds of pepper from Alexandria alone, or fully as much pepper as in the period before the Portuguese had entered the spice trade.[36] Uncorroborated this

[34] Sanuto, VI. 156–157, 170, 199–207. Cargoes reaching Venice from Alexandria are recorded as follows:

1508, 1100 colli, *ibid.*, VII. 591, 597.

1509, none returned.

1510, 1000 colli, *ibid.*, X. 799, XI. 57, 69; Fulin, p. 209.

1511, none returned.

1512, 1180 colli, Sanuto, XIV. 25–26.

1513, 300 colli, *ibid.*, XVI. 177, 209.

[35] Sanuto, XVIII. 178; XXXV. 254, 332, 337; XXXVI. 382; Senato Mar., reg. 18, f. 29; Arsenale, busta 8, ff. 2–3, busta 9, f. 37; Senato Deliberazione, Incanti Galere, reg. 2, libri iv and v.

[36] Museo Civico, Venice, Archivio Donà della Rosa, busta 217, f. 276. The authenticity of documents in this bundle is discussed in the note to Table A. The figures are given first in "colli e nichesse" and then in "cantara". The figure given above is computed from the number of "cantara" assuming they were the *cantara forfori*, the measure used

one document may not be considered conclusive, but it suggests the possibility of a revision of ideas concerning the later sixteenth century Levant trade.[37]

It is true, however, that in the opening years of the sixteenth century the Venetian supply of spices, especially of pepper, was considerably less than it had been, and that throughout the century Venetian traders in the West met competition from Portuguese sources. This may be counted one reason why between 1509 and 1535 all the voyages of the Venetian merchant galleys westward were discontinued. Aside from the risks resulting from the wars of the early sixteenth century, there was far less prospect of profit to warrant sending west to Spain, Portugal, England, or Flanders the expensive great galleys whose sole justification had been their adaptability to precious cargoes.

Lack of spices was not the only reason why the galley voyages were so largely discontinued. Even before the Portuguese discovery the Venetian state had been forced to offer bounties with the galleys to persuade anyone to rent them for the western voyages. Whereas in the period 1418–1427 the England and Flanders galleys were auctioned for prices which brought the state an average of about 5400 ducats for the fleet each year,[38] in the period 1480–1489 a subsidy of 1000 to 5000 ducats was offered with each galley auctioned and the amounts bid were far less than these subsidies. For all three of the western voyages the state was practically giving the use of the galley and something besides in order that wares be safely moved and the position of Venice as world market be maintained.[39] To raise freight rates presumably would have handicapped

at Alexandria in selling pepper, equal to ninety-four lbs. See Bartholomeo de Paxi, *Tariffa de Pexi e Mesure* (Venice, 1503), no paging, and Adolf Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der Romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (Munich, Berlin, 1906), p. 814. Had the computation been made by assuming that "nichesse" like "colli" contained 1120 lbs., the result would have been 1,668,800 lbs.

37 Contrast the statement by J. A. Goris, *Étude sur les Colonies Marchandes Méridionales à Anvers de 1488 à 1567* (Louvain, 1925), p. 195. See also the discussion by A. H. Lybyer, The Ottoman Turks and the Routes of Oriental Trade, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXX. 577, and, The Influence of the Rise of the Turks upon the Routes of Oriental Trade, in Amer. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1914, I. 125.

38 The amount received for the galleys is recorded in the registers of the senate after the resolutions for auctioning them. These resolutions occur at about the same time each year, those for the Flemish galleys in January or February. Galleys also went at this time to Aigues-Mortes, usually auctioned in January and yielded an average yearly profit of about 1850 ducats.

39 The three voyages operated at a loss to the state were those to Flanders, Aigues-Mortes and Barbary. The Levant galleys, protected by their monopoly of the spice transport, continued to yield a profit as in the earlier period.

Venetian traders using the galleys, but only in case there were other ships able to offer better service in proportion to what they charged.

Such a ship had been created by the transformation which took place in the rigging of round ships during the fifteenth century, and by the development of firearms. The transformation of the one-masted cog into a full-rigged, three-masted ship possessed of spritsail, topsail, and mizzen lateen sail occurred about the middle of that century. The importance of the change is stressed by specialists on early shipping. For example, Oppenheim says that the sailing ships of 1485 differed less in appearance from sailing ships of 1785 than they did from those of 1425.[40] These changes in rigging may not have materially increased the speed of the ship, but they made her much more manageable. From the point of view of safety the advantages which the oars had given to the great galley were thus largely counterbalanced by the new rig of the round ship.

Equally important in robbing the merchant galley of the special security which had alone justified its existence was the increase in the use of guns in naval warfare. A high round ship well furnished with cannon and properly manned could provide as good protection from attack as a low galley whose crews were comparatively unprotected from gunshot. The light galley long remained important in Mediterranean war fleets because galleys were needed to chase galleys. But merchantmen required not offensive but defensive strength. The great galley had always been so expensive a vessel that its freight rates had been double those of the round ships. As long as the galleys were so much safer that it was considered unnecessary to insure the wares they carried, they could maintain their position. But when better rigging and the use of muskets and cannon deprived the merchant galley of its superior safety, it could no longer compete with the cheaper type of shipping.

Certainly the decline of the merchant galley fleets of Venice was out of all proportion to the decline of her trade. To some extent what had before 1535 been carried by the galleys was thereafter carried by round ships,[41] and this may be one explanation of the renewed prosperity of

[40] M. Oppenheim, *A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy and of Merchant Shipping in Relation to the Navy* (London, New York, 1896), p. 40. See also A. Anthiaume, *Le Navire et sa Construction en France et principalement chez les Normands* (Paris, 1922), pp. 57, 64, 127; Bernhard Hagedorn, *Die Entwicklung der Wichtigsten Schiffstypen bis ins 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1914), pp. 54–64; and Romola and R. C. Anderson, *The Sailing Ship* (London, 1926), ch. VII.

[41] The ship lists of 1558–1560 cited below do not show, however, any voyages by round ships to the North African ports which the galleys had visited. The rise of the pirate states is the probable explanation of the loss of this trade.

private shipping at Venice after the discontinuance of most of the galley voyages.

The mid-sixteenth century was probably the period when the Venetian built fleet of ships designed for trade beyond the Adriatic, namely, those of 240 tons or more, was the largest in its history. Certainly the number and capacity of such round ships in private hands had doubled since the beginning of the century, a gain which far more than counterbalanced the decline of the merchant galley fleets. In 1558–1559 the Venetian merchant marine included forty round ships of 240 tons or more having a total capacity of 18,000 tons.[42] The principal voyages on which the ships were employed is shown in the accompanying table (Table A). A comparison between the voyages at that date and at a date in the previous period of prosperity well before the discovery of new trade routes has been made in Table B, so far as information from the earlier period permits. Except that no figures have been found at the earlier date for the grain trade or for the relatively short voyages, the trades compared may be considered fairly representative. They suggest comparative stabilization. There is a local shift in trade center from Syria to Cyprus, for in 1558–1560 there were almost no clearances for Syria, whereas in 1450 Cyprus had been of secondary importance. Apparently cotton, which in the fifteenth century furnished the bulk of the cargo of the ships from Syria, was in the sixteenth century produced in Cyprus, whose sugar plantations, famous in the fifteenth century, had meanwhile been ruined by the competition of the new Portuguese possessions in the West.[43] While, however, Cyprus furnished the bulk of the freight in the sixteenth century, Venetians were still active in Syria and some part of the ship cargoes may have come directly or indirectly from the mainland. Another slight change between the two dates is the increase in the size of ships used. Ships of 600 tons were numerous in Venice in the mid-sixteenth century not only because Venetians had, by means of them, regained at least in part the carrying trade between the Mediterranean and the English Channel, but also because such ships were more largely employed on purely Mediterranean voyages. That does not suggest that the volume of trade had been decreased by the Portuguese discoveries.

A definite break in this maritime prosperity of Venice appears in

[42] Only about 4000 tons of active shipping was lost by the stoppage of galley voyages, a fall from 5000 tons to 1000 tons, between 1501 and 1540. A list of the names and sizes of all Venetian ships of 240 tons or more in 1557–1560, in addition to the record of voyages, is given in Museo Civico, Venice, Archivio Donà della Rosa, busta 217.

[43] Sanuto, I. 270–271; *The Travels of Pedro Teixeira* [Hakluyt Society, 1902], p. 134.

1570–1577 with the short but expensive war with Turkey, the loss of Cyprus, and the plague which killed a quarter to a third of her population. The notable fact in the resultant crisis is not the blow dealt by such a disastrous conjunction of calamities, though this was adequate cause for an interruption of activity, but the lack of resilience which prevented Venice from again establishing her merchant marine on its former basis. This incapacity to come back and regain her former position was not due to a decline of Mediterranean trade, or to a decrease in the volume of goods to be moved between her ports, but to the unstable basis of her shipbuilding industry.

The period before 1570 had been a time of prosperity only for the builders of large ships. The smaller vessels employed in bringing grain, wine, oil, and cheese to Venice had not been made in the city but had been bought abroad, for there were no Venetian ships of their size to go on the voyages which these smaller, foreign built ships undertook. Such was the testimony of the Venetian board of trade.[44] Thus it appears that although the builders of large ships had definitely recovered during the sixteenth century from the depression which occurred in the late fifteenth century, the part of the shipbuilding industry devoted to supplying the more numerous small ships for the Adriatic trade had been definitely lost.

And the building of large ships had been kept at Venice chiefly by the presence there of skilled artisans and the advantages which were enjoyed by ships entitled to fly the banner of San Marco. Otherwise they, too, might have been purchased from foreigners. In 1531 complaints of the number of large foreign built vessels which were being purchased by Venetians and even granted the right to sail as Venetian led to the reenactment of the laws which forbade such practices.[45] But the laws could not be strictly enforced. In times of famine whoever brought grain to Venice was sure of good will, and if he bought a foreign ship in order to bring the grain it was with the hope that the ship would be given the privileges of Venetian registry. Thus, in 1542 and 1543 five foreign ships were granted the right to fly the Venetian flag. Four had been bought at Constantinople and sent to Venice with grain, and the other was a Basque ship which had been in the service of the state.[46]

Another way to evade the law was to refit or finish at Venice a ship originally built elsewhere. The petition of Giovanni Morello, for example, explained that he and his associates had begun a ship in the Po

[44] Cinque Savii, ser. 1, busta 135, ff. 99–100.

[45] Senato Mar., reg. 22, f. 85.

[46] *Ibid.*, reg. 26, ff. 72, 98, 99, 107; reg. 27, f. 30. That was an unusually large number for so short a space of time and was occasioned by a particular grain shortage.

River solely because of the supply there of wood which could not be had at Venice without great damage to the arsenal. Or again, the Querini brothers recounted how they had lost a 720 ton ship from which they had salvaged rigging and artillery. They wished to build another but found difficulty in getting the necessary wood and so bought and refitted a Basque ship. Another instructive petition explained that the body of the ship only had been made away from Venice while the decks and castles had been added at Venice.[47] The large number of such petitions creates the suspicion that although pine and larch for superstructures could be had at Venice, the oak essential for body timbers had become dear and very hard to find there.

This impression is strengthened by an examination of the shipbuilding industry in the Dalmatian city of Curzola in the sixteenth century. In favor of Curzola an exemption had been made to the general rule that large ships should not be built in Dalmatia by Venetian capital, and Venetians were building there ships of 300 to 600 tons. They were aided by licenses to export the materials needed to finish their ships free of duties. The list of what they exported may make one wonder why they chose to build away from Venice since it included pine and larch planks, masts and spars, iron, pitch, and cordage. But Curzola is conveniently placed across the Adriatic from the forests of Monte San Angelo in Apulia, the source of the timbers used in the celebrated Ragusan ships.[48]

Certainly the oaks grown in the Venetian dominions did not suffice for both the demands of the arsenal and those of the private builders, and despite the constant effort of the state to preserve the oak woods, ship timbers were harder and harder to find. In 1546 when a tax was proposed on licenses to cut oak, it was asserted that it would not greatly affect the builders of large ships since they did not cut in Venetian territory one-third of the oak logs they used. Whether that statement be accurate or not, the cutting of oak for private builders was sufficient to cause the arsenal alarm for its own supply. Accordingly, the senate in 1559 provided that thereafter all those receiving state loans to help them build their ships must agree to cut no oak in the dominions of the Signoria.[49] There was no complaint of immediate depression because of the neces-

[47] *Ibid.*, reg. 28, ff. 85, 92; reg. 36, f. 115; files, Sept. and Oct., 1545, Feb. 25, 1564. The Querini brothers stated that twenty-five others, of whom they named fourteen, had been granted the favor they sought, namely, Venetian registry.

[48] Senato Mar., reg. 21, ff. 61, 85; reg. 22, f. 13; reg. 29, f. 168; Cinque Savii, ser. 1, busta 135, ff. 65, 83. Bartolomeo Crescentio, *Nautica Mediterranea* (Rome, 1607), pp. 3–5; Pantero Pantera, *L'Armata Navale* (Rome, 1614), p. 67.

[49] Senato Mar., files, Dec. 28, 1546; reg. 34, f. 57.

sity of seeking lumber abroad. Yet from buying abroad the essential timbers to buying abroad the ship itself was only a step.

That step was taken about 1590 after the offer of bounties had failed to revive Venetian shipbuilding to its former levels. The law against granting Venetian registry to foreign built ships was repealed and between 1590 and 1599 the records of the board of trade mention fifteen such large ships for which Venetian registry was sought. During that same period eight large ships were built in Venice, and thirteen in Venetian possessions.[50] The Venetians bought most ships from Holland although they found some in the island of Patmos and some in the Black Sea. The activities of Francesco Morosini are significant for the international shipbuilding situation of the time. He was interested in the business of transporting wine from Crete to the West, but preferred to build his ships in Holland instead of in Venice. After beginning one 720 ton ship in Holland he promised to build four more if he were granted bounties for them and Venetian registry. Although his ships were not granted bounties they were given Venetian registry and five were built.[51]

Some years later, however, in 1627, even those buying approved foreign built ships were offered bounties.[52] But before such extreme measures were taken, the favors shown to purchasers of foreign ships had enabled the Venetian marine to make a tardy and partial recovery from the slump which had followed 1577. The number of ships of 360 tons or more in the fleet in 1606 compares not unfavorably with similar figures for 1558–1559 as follows:

In 1558–1559, 27 ships, total tonnage 14,850 tons.
In 1606, 27 ships, total tonnage 11,460 tons.

But more than half of the fleet, fourteen ships, were in 1606 of foreign build.[53] The continually increasing dependence on foreign built ships is

[50] Cinque Savii, ser. 1, busta 25, ff. 71–75, 101, 112, 124; busta 26, ff. 35, 110, 117, 181, 182, 193, 195; busta 27, f. 12; busta 138, ff. 160, 169; busta 139, ff. 5, 9, 70, 73, 135, 167; busta 140, f. 61.

[51] *Ibid.*, busta 27, f. 37; busta 139, f. 167; busta 141, f. 124; Senato Mar., files, Mar. 29, 1597.

[52] *Parti Prese . . . in Materia de Navi e sua Navigatione*, pp. 32–33. Three ships were immediately bought with the aid of the loans, the bounties taking that form, and all three were "Fiamengo", *i.e.*, Dutch. Cinque Savii, ser. 1, busta 147, ff. 113, 126, 186.

[53] Museo Civico, Venice, Archivio Donà della Rosa, busta 217, f. 46, an abstract of a report of the board of trade which is referred to in their archive, Cinque Savii, ser. 1, busta 141, f. 128, although it is there stated that there were twenty-six such ships in all, twelve Venetian and fourteen foreign built.

emphasized by an enumeration of the merchant fleet in 1693 which gives the following figures:[54]

Four-masted ships,	
Made in Venice	9
Of foreign make bought by Venetians	35
On the shipyards	5
On voyage for Hebrews	6
Marciliane, smaller ships used in the Adriatic	68

The decline in Venetian shipbuilding was therefore obviously far greater than any decline in Venetian commerce. The papers of the board of trade give vividly the impression that in the early seventeenth century there was plenty of trade being done in the Mediterranean and that Venetian-built ships were not numerous enough to carry even the business that was in Venetian hands. Neither the advance of the Turk, nor the supposed exhaustion of Venice in the Italian wars, nor the reputed loss of the spice trade to the Portuguese can be said to have ruined her commerce. The passing of the maritime glory of Venice was primarily a failure to keep up with other seagoing peoples who expanded more rapidly. A basic reason for this failure was the exhaustion of one of the most vital of her natural resources, ship timber.

When this depletion of the oak woods was first clearly recognized—in the last half of the fifteenth century—[55] the shortage seems to have been peculiar to Venice. At least the Ragusans and Basques had a sufficiently plentiful supply so that their competition was severely felt. At the end of the sixteenth century the scarcity of oak timber appears to have been general throughout Mediterranean countries.[56] In the seventeenth century maritime supremacy was definitely in the hands of that people who controlled the lumber resources of the Baltic, the Dutch.[57]

[54] Cinque Savii, ser. 3, busta 97.

[55] For specific statements of the concern of the government with the harm done to private shipbuilding by the lack of oak timber, see Arsenale, busta 6, f. 16 and busta 8, ff. 73–75; Senato Mar., reg. 19, f. 120. For the elaborate conservation policy then developed, see Adolfo di Berenger, *Saggio Storico della Legislazione Veneta Forestale dal Sec. VII. al XIX.* (Venice, 1863).

[56] The exhaustion of Spanish supplies is indicated by C. H. Haring, *Trade and Navigation between Spain and the Indies in the Time of the Hapsburgs* (Cambridge, 1918), pp. 259–261, and Julius Klein, *The Mesta: a Study in Spanish Economic History, 1273–1836* (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 320–321.

[57] Violet Barbour, Dutch and English Merchant Shipping in the Seventeenth Century, *Ec. Hist Rev.*, II. 261 ff. Miss Barbour emphasizes the extent to which the supremacy of Dutch shipping during the seventeenth century is bound up with the Dutch control of the Baltic timber trade. On Baltic supplies and English oak, see, R. G. Albion, *Forests and Sea Power* (Cambridge, 1926), chs. III. and IV.

It is not intended here to deny that the opening of the oceanic trades placed Venice under other handicaps. Her naval and military resources were so thoroughly committed to defending her position against the Turk that she could not have given political backing to merchants adventuring to the Indies. Her rigid commercial policy had been shaped with the one thought of drawing the maximum advantage from her strategic location on the route between Europe and the Near East. Such of her nobles as remained merchants were bound both by capital investments and commercial habits to the long exploited and still profitable Levant trade. The peoples of Western Europe, unhampered by such heavy fetters of past greatness, and bred to the navigation of the open ocean, could more readily profit from the new opportunities. But Venice faced the additional, and, it would seem, decisive disadvantage that she depended upon her competitors for the essential instruments of commerce, ships.

The need for ships was enormously increased in the sixteenth century by the development of the transoceanic trades. This new demand could not be met by the old shipbuilding centers in Italy. An attempt to meet it was made by the Iberian ports, but before the end of the century their supplies were giving out. The carrying trade of both the Indies and even that of the Mediterranean then passed in very large measure to the countries of northwest Europe able to draw upon the still unexhausted forests of that region. In analyzing the shift of economic leadership from the Mediterranean to northwest Europe one should consider not only the migration of technique, the shifts in trade routes and trade centers, and the relative effectiveness of political organization, but also the depletion of the natural resources of the Mediterranean regions.

FREDERIC CHAPIN LANE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

TABLE A

NUMBER AND CAPACITY OF SHIPS OF 240 TONS OR MORE EMPLOYED ON DIFFERENT VOYAGES FROM VENICE, 1558–1560

VOYAGE	Number and Capacity of Ships cleared, by Periods.							
	Average of 1558 and 1559.		Full year 1558.		Full year 1559.		First six months of 1560.	
	No. of ships	Capacity in tons	No. of ships	Capacity in tons	No. of ships	Capacity in tons	No. of ships	Capacity in tons
All voyages	44-45	20,400	41	20,040	48	20,760	27	12,840
Cyprus and Syria	13	7,170	11	6,060	15	8,280	10	5,640
Grain	11	4,920	13	6,120	9	3,720	5	2,580
England and "West"	3	1,830	4	2,640	2	1,020	3	1,380
Constantinople	3-4	1,680	4	1,620	3	1,740	1	600
Corfu and Zante	2-3	1,050	1	540	4	1,560	2	720
Alexandria	2	810	1	540	3	1,080	2	840
Others	9-10	2,940	7	2,520	12	3,360	4	1,080

The table is based on a document in the Museo Civico, Venice, Archivio Donà della Rosa, busta 217, entitled Navi Grosse de Venetia, loro Viaggi e loro Patroni. The bundle contains, besides other documents referred to in the present article, a copy of a treaty made in 1442 through Andrea Donà and various papers recognized by the archivists as in the handwriting of Leonardo Donà, doge of Venice, 1600–1612. Apparently they are all papers accumulated by the Donà family during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. There is therefore no obvious reason to doubt the authenticity of these shiplists. The list of voyages gives the exact day of the departure and of the arrival in Istria and in the port of Malamocco, except that there is no mention of the return of most of the ships sailing in 1560. The earliest entry on this list is of Oct. 19, 1557, and the latest July 6, 1560, so that the lack of mention of the return of ships sailing in 1560 suggests that the list is contemporaneous with the voyages.

Although some of the ships recorded as clearing for Cyprus almost certainly loaded grain also, voyages for grain are entered as a separate item because some ships are mentioned as clearing for a grain voyage without any more precise designation. This is to be accounted for by the fact that the Signoria arranged with ship captains to sail over a general area and collect what grain they could find. Of the total of twenty-seven ships clearing in the two and a half years for grain, sixteen are recorded without further indication, four sailed for Volo, three for "the Archipelago", two for Sicily, one for La Cavalla, and one for

Cyprus. It is to be noted that the years in question were as a whole years of bad crops on the mainland and country people came to Venice to buy. Agostino Agostini, *Istoria Veneziano*, ff. 251–262, in Bibl. Quirini Stampalia, Venice, MSS. Cl. IV., cod. 16.

If averages for the three years were taken, constructing figures for the full year 1560 from those for the first six months, on the assumption that the total clearances for that year were in the same proportion to those for its first half as the totals for 1558 and 1559 were to the first halves of those years, the averages so obtained would not differ from those given by as much as two ships except in the case of grain. About seventy per cent. of the grain clearances were in August and since grain imports varied seasonally the clearances for the first six months are not adequate evidence of the clearances for the whole year.

TABLE B

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER AND CAPACITY OF SHIPS CLEARING ANNUALLY FOR SELECTED VOYAGES ABOUT 1448–1449 AND IN 1558–1559

VOYAGE	Number and Capacity of Ships cleared, by periods.			
	Number of ships		Capacity in tons	
	1448-1449	1558-1559	1448-1449	1558-1559
Syria and/or Cyprus	12	13	5,400	7,170
English Channel and the "West"	3	3	1,800	1,830
Constantinople and/or Black Sea	3	3-4	1,300	1,680

The figures for the later period are taken from Table A. The figures for the earlier period are estimates obtained as follows:

The estimates for the voyage to Syria and Cyprus are based on statements of the number and capacity of the ships going in the spring *muda* 1418, the spring and fall *mude* 1426, spring and fall 1427, spring 1428, spring and fall 1431, fall 1433, and fall 1449. See Senato Misti, reg. 52, f. 66; reg. 55, ff. 181–191; reg. 56, ff. 16, 25, 56, 71, 75, 104, 114, 152–156; reg. 58, ff. 19, 22, 26, 46, 53, 60, 62, 73, 190, 213; Notatorio di Collegio, nos. 7–10.

The estimate of the number going to England and the "West", which is taken to mean beyond the Straits of Gibraltar, is based on mention of ships in 1446, 1448, 1449. Senato Mar., reg. 2, f. 156; reg. 3, ff. 43, 48–49, 70, 121, 135. The estimate of capacity is based on mention of the size of some of the ships in lists in the Notatorio, and on the considerations that the largest ships were used on the voyage and that there were at least six Venetian ships of 600 tons or more at the time. Notatorio, nos. 10 and 12, f. 98.

The estimates for Constantinople and the Black Sea are based on the mention of ships on that voyage in 1446–1448 (Senato Mar., reg. 2, f. 134; reg. 3, ff. 48, 53, 58), and the statements of the number and size going at the beginning of the century, 1398, 1400–1402 (Notatorio, no. 5). The number of ships was the same at the beginning and middle of the century.

THE ENGLISH GAME LAW SYSTEM

THE country gentlemen of the eighteenth century found themselves in control of the government of England. In the course of centuries of struggle the landed classes, with the assistance of others, had encroached upon the royal power until they dominated the situation. From the House of Lords, their citadel, they ruled the House of Commons. From the Commons, with some assistance from the wealthy merchants, they ruled the country. From the bench, as justices of the peace in petty sessions and quarter sessions, they ruled the provinces. To correspond with this control, and to some extent as a reward for their services, they were able to secure social and other privileges. One of the most dearly prized of these was the exclusive right to indulge in field sports.

The game laws, which defined and protected their sporting rights, had evolved by a long process out of the Norman forest laws.[1] The ancient forests having been privileged places for royal sport, the barons when they increased in power or when they gained the favor of the sovereign, secured special franchises for themselves. These, under the various names of chases, parks, and free warrens, were modifications, for subjects, of the principle of the forest and gave exclusive sporting rights in particular places to specified individuals, sometimes, at first, even over land in the possession of others.

In course of time this method of providing for the aristocratic monopoly of sport by personal grant came to seem inadequate and general game laws based upon an aristocratic principle were set up. The first clear statute of this type was written into the statute book in 1390, when all persons were forbidden to keep hunting dogs or kill "Deer, Hares, nor Conies, nor other Gentlemen's Game" unless they had real estate worth forty shillings a year, or in the case of clergy an annual income of ten pounds.[2] This meant in effect that sport was restricted to the governing classes.

[1] This process of development to the end of the seventeenth century has been discussed briefly in an article by Chester and Ethyn Kirby, The Stuart Game Prerogative, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LXVI. 239–254. The early origins of the game laws are dealt with by Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *Studies and Notes Supplementary to Stubbs' Constitutional History*, II. [University of Manchester Publications, no. XCI.] (Manchester, 1914). See also G. J. Turner, ed., *Select Pleas of the Forest* [Publications of the Selden Society, XIII.] (London, 1901); and John Manwood, *A Treatise and Discourse of the Lawes of the Forrest* (London, 1598).

[2] 13 Ric. II., stat. 1, c. 13; *cf.* 34 Edw. III., c. 22. The text reads "savagine levres ne

The act of 1390 gave rise to a long series of statutes directed to revising, reënforcing, and redefining the sporting privilege, acts to put down poaching, acts restricting the use of undesirable methods or devices in taking game, acts establishing closed seasons, acts prohibiting the sale of game. These culminated in 1671 in a measure which, with its supplementary legislation, formed the basic law of the game system for a hundred and sixty years. By its provisions the taking of game was prohibited to persons who did not come within any one of four categories. The first included every person "haveing Lands and Tenements or some other Estate of Inheritance in his owne or his Wifes right of the cleare yearely value of one hundred pounds per annum or for terme of life". The second consisted of those who had "Lease or Leases of ninety nine yeares or for any longer terme, of the cleare yearely value of one hundred and fifty pounds". Every "Sonne and Heire apparent of an Esquire, or [of] other person of higher degree" was also excepted from the prohibition. And lastly owners of franchises, so far as their specified privileges extended, were exempted. As in the case of the act of 1390, this measure did not specifically qualify anyone to kill game, but in effect it meant that the class of sportsmen was more narrowly defined than ever before and restricted to the landed classes.[3] Propertyless persons were disqualified; even the possessors of personal property, no matter how wealthy, if they had not sufficient land also, were excluded.

This act of 1671 did not in so many words impose any penalties upon unqualified persons taking game, but it gave official status to the class of gamekeepers, who acted as a kind of special police in the enforcement of the game laws. Before this time the gamekeepers appointed by private individuals had been merely servants who possessed no particular sanction of the law. For general purposes of enforcement, the king had exercised an ancient prerogative derived from the forest law and appointed keepers over wide areas much as he set up his warders in the various forests. This procedure proving unsatisfactory for country-wide policing,[4] the act of 1671 now authorized every lord of a manor to appoint a gamekeeper who should have the power to confiscate all paraphernalia of sport, such as guns, dogs, or nets, found in the possession of unquali-

conilles nautre desduit des gentils". The translation of "savagine" as "deer" is doubtful. The editors of the *Statutes of the Realm* mention in a footnote that the old translation in MS. Harleian 4999 says, "wielde hares, conynges ne non other disport of gentilmen". It may be that the correct reading should be "Savages ne levres ne conilles nautre desduit des gentils".

[3] 22–23 Car. II., c. 25; *cf.* 7 Jac. I., c. 11.

[4] This subject is dealt with in the article by Chester and Ethyn Kirby, *loc. cit.*

fied persons. For this purpose he was to search the houses of suspected persons and thus he acted somewhat as a government official. It is evident that the lord of the manor was becoming a kind of local governor in the realm of sport.

On this foundation, their control of the government being assured by the revolution of 1688, the landed aristocracy proceeded in the next generation to construct an elaborate system of regulations and penalties which practically superseded, without actually repealing, the maze of earlier laws. An act of 1691 gave almost unlimited authority to keepers of deer parks to resist poachers and by a heavy fine of twenty pounds for trespass in parks ensured that most trespassers would have to suffer a year's imprisonment and an hour in the pillory for non-payment of the penalty.[5] In the following year real penalties, over and above the mere confiscation authorized by the act of 1671, were imposed on the pursuit of game by unqualified persons. With a fine altruistic gesture the gentry ordered "inferiour Tradesmen Apprentices and other dissolute persons" not to "presume to hunt hawke fish or fowle" as this led them to neglect their "Trades and Employments".[6] The sale of game having been declared illegal early in the seventeenth century, Parliament in Queen Anne's reign declared a penalty of five pounds for every head of game found in the possession of any "Higlar Chapman Carrier Innkeeper Victualler or Alehouse Keeper". The twenty shilling penalty of the act of 1692 on the possession of poaching dogs or instruments was increased to five pounds. This consequently meant three or four months' imprisonment for non-payment.[7] The killing of game at night was absolutely prohibited, qualification or no qualification.[8]

These statutes constitute the main legal framework of the game system as it existed during the Hanoverian era. In the Middle Ages, and even as late as the seventeenth century, aristocratic sport had rested largely on the royal prerogative, which set up forests, scattered the franchises of chase, park, and free warren with an open hand, and by royally appointed gamekeepers attempted to police the game of the whole country. The forest laws had fallen into disuse by the end of the sixteenth

[5] 3 Wm. and Mary, c. 10. Taking or killing deer entailed a penalty of thirty pounds; pulling down the pales or walls of enclosures was punishable by three months' imprisonment. The act applied to forests, chases, purlieus, paddocks, woods, parks, or any other enclosed ground where deer were kept.

[6] 4 Wm. and Mary, c. 23.

[7] 6 Anne, c. 16 (usually cited as 5 Anne, c. 14); made permanent by 9 Anne, c. 27, s. 1. Carriers for qualified persons were excepted from the penalty.

[8] 9 Anne, c. 27, s. 4.

century and the franchise from one cause and another had generally declined by the eighteenth. The general game laws, originated probably to bolster up these privileged places, had become the real game system, and, although a host of unrepealed and obscure statutes remained to clutter up the law books, the measures which begin with the act of 1671 and end in the reign of Queen Anne constitute the essential outlines. This situation corresponds nicely with the political facts of the time.

It also corresponds with the character of eighteenth century field sports. No other form of amusement was so ardently pursued or so jealously defended by the privileged classes of the Georgian era. They regarded their game as "more sacred than any other class of property". Hunting to them was a kingly sport, "to be followed only by a superior order of men". Already in the fourteenth century game had been "gentlemen's game", and in the reign of Charles II. a book on sport was naturally called *The Gentleman's Recreation*.[9] Throughout the eighteenth century the statesmen were also customarily sportsmen. Later, Lord Eldon, the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, revelled in their dogs and their pheasants, the one for their skill in the field and the other for their consenting to be killed. To the confirmed fox hunter, sport was an orgy in which he rode his horse often to the point of fatal exhaustion and roused himself to such a roaring humor that only coarse jokes and quantities of drink, into which the fox's pad had been dipped for added zest, could satisfy him. It is small wonder that he discovered the secret of English liberty in the sports of the field.

> Yet when England at tyrants would level defiance,
> Say, what makes her sons so undauntedly bleed?
> 'Tis the chase—'tis the study of this noble science
> Gives spirit, and vigour, and health to the breed.[10]

Deer hunting, fox hunting, hare hunting, and coursing all had their ardent devotees. The luxury and artificiality characteristic of the age invaded these hunting sports and led to the introduction of the carted stag, the subscription pack, and the bag fox. The sport of the gun underwent still greater elaboration. Shooting birds on the wing, a novel feat in 1700, became universal in the next fifty years, and before the end of the century the battue, as the practice of driving game to the shooters with the aid of beaters was called, was being introduced with all its

[9] 13 Ric. II., stat. 1, c. 13; Nicholas Cox, *The Gentleman's Recreation* (London, 1674), and Richard Blome, *The Gentleman's Recreation* (London, 1686).

[10] T. B. Johnson, *The Sportsman's Cyclopedia* (London, 1831), p. 130.

abandoned butchery. Like the sports, so the sportsmen also varied greatly, from the wealthy aristocrat who could supply game in the quantities suitable for the battue, to the poorer farmer or squire; from the enthusiastic sportsman who lived and died with his hounds and gun, to the gentleman who shot occasionally and casually. These amusements were known everywhere. No part of the country was entirely without them, even if it had only a bedraggled hunt addicted to the pursuit of the bag fox.

Manifestly such a vast and universal system, ardently beloved as it was, could not exist in such a country as England without the greatest pains being taken for the maintenance of a supply of game. The protection provided by the game laws and the natural presence of a few birds and hares could hardly satisfy the growing appetite of the voracious guns. Even the importation of game from France and its sale for food was no remedy, as it provided no one with any sport. Consequently the law made no distinction between foreign and domestic game and London dealers in the former were prosecuted accordingly in 1766.[11] The specter of scarcity constantly threatened sport. To dispel it the country gentlemen resorted to artificial methods of preservation.

Every forest and franchise had been a game preserve. Now every squire, greatly aided, no doubt, by the rapid increase of enclosures in the eighteenth century,[12] set about raising game by artificial means. The pheasant, still a rather scarce bird at the beginning of the eighteenth century, lent itself to human care. The barnyard fowl was called into requisition for hatching the eggs and as soon as the pheasants reached an age at which they could take care of themselves they were turned out into the covers. There the gamekeepers fed them in severe weather to prevent their wandering from the estate in search of food.[13] Partridges, though more difficult to keep on the estate, could be dealt with in the same manner. The Duke of Richmond for a time imported more than a thousand eggs annually from France to be hatched on his estates

[11] *Public Advertiser*, Mar. 10, 1766.

[12] *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser*, Sept. 3, 1784, letter from "Observator" who states: "The breed of game in this country has considerably increased in consequence of the numerous inclosures, which tend in a great measure to protect and rear it to maturity." But *cf. Sporting Magazine*, LII. (April, 1818) 20.

[13] Oliver Goldsmith, *An History of the Earth and Animated Nature* (London, 1774), III. 187; William Cobbett, *Rural Rides* (London, 1885), I. 245; *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, Appointed to Take into Consideration the Laws Relating to Game, Parliamentary Papers*, 1828, VIII., no. 235, p. 48; Peter Hawker, *Instructions to Young Sportsmen*, 2nd ed. (London, 1816), p. 200.

in Sussex.[14] Hares took care of themselves, and, when they were not killed too rapidly, sometimes accumulated in fabulous numbers.

The gamekeepers made it their business to encourage in every possible way the natural multiplication of game. Vermin they killed off as thoroughly as possible. They watched the nests of the birds and often took out the eggs to be hatched more safely under common hens. Further encouragement the sportsmen themselves supplied when they could induce themselves to spare the hen pheasants and partridges with a view to the next year's breed.

Not all gentlemen preserved with equal strictness. Those in some unfavorable parts of the country found that high preservation did not repay their efforts. Others felt satisfied with a somewhat more economical policy and less game, which, they maintained, supplied more real sport. Then, too, some lands, naturally, fell into the hands of old and invalid gentlemen or ladies who had no interest at all in sport. Such "lawless country" lay open to trespassing sportsman and poacher alike and was a bane to the preserving gentry.[15]

It was the gamekeeper who acted as the agent of the privileged class. The act of 1671, which first gave him a recognized status, authorized him to seize the sporting paraphernalia of unqualified persons on the manor where he served. Subsequent acts extended his competence, empowering him to seize poachers at night and to use all necessary force for the purpose, and giving him the right, with the authorization of the lord of the manor, to kill game.[16]

This last provision resulted in the appointment of many aristocrats to the office. For not all members of the upper classes were legally qualified, since, for example, younger sons of esquires had neither the landed property nor the rank requisite under the law. Consequently gentlemen often used the gamekeeper's appointment as a convenient means of giving a qualification to an otherwise unfortunate friend. A tax on deputations to gamekeepers in 1784 was objected to as a tax on these favors; and the list of keepers in Norfolk in 1787 included several esquires (by courtesy) and one baronet.[17]

The common gamekeeper was quite different. Ideally he was a

[14] *Sporting Magazine*, II. (Aug., 1793) 301.

[15] Such a condition is described in Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey, ed., *The Diary of Colonel Peter Hawker* (London, 1893), I. 12, 147, 157.

[16] 4 Wm. and Mary, c. 23; 6 Anne, c. 16; the act of 9 Anne, c. 27, restricted this last right to a single keeper on each manor.

[17] *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser*, Sept. 2, 1784; Norfolk *Chronicle*, Nov. 17, 1787.

sober, honest, industrious man, with a knack for killing vermin, and a boldness and shrewdness which would not fail him in encounters with poachers. In practice he was usually some bold pugnacious laborer, often a former poacher chosen on the maxim "set a thief to catch a thief", famed for his accurate shooting, but hardly trained in the finer duties of his trade. He could not often resist the constant temptation to sell game on the sly. Indeed, the keepers were accused of being the greatest poachers in the country.[18] And the combination of ignorance and authority all too often made him into a brutal and arrogant man, despised and hated by all the surrounding countryside.

In practice the gamekeeper served largely as a police officer, following suspicious characters about the manor in order to discover them poaching, watching snares in order to take the poacher who came for his booty, patrolling the fields at night. To him the poacher was in the same class as vermin, to be given no quarter beyond what the law required. Both he and his master could think of nothing more despicable than the surreptitious thief of the expensively raised and protected birds and hares.

Nothing illustrates this attitude more clearly than the use of traps and spring guns to catch the poacher and his dog. Typical of numerous advertisements in provincial newspapers of the later eighteenth century is this notice published in the Norfolk *Chronicle* on January 7, 1786:

GAME

A Caution

Whereas the plantations and covers of William Colhoun, Esq., at Wretham, have lately been infested by the poachers, and the game in them very much destroyed; and one of the poachers, a notorious offender, being taken on Monday, Dec. 19, by his keepers and their assistants, this is to give notice, that in the future there will be MEN TRAPS and SPRING GUNS in the plantations, carrs, and covers set every night, there being no road or foot path whatever through them.

No doubt the preservers often trusted to the terror inspired by such notices rather than to the actual use of their murderous devices; this may be the explanation of another advertisement warning of the presence of "man traps, snakes, and spring guns". But there is no doubt that the spring guns were often actually used and not infrequently with fatal

[18] William Taplin, *Observations on the Present State of the Game* (London, 1772), pp. 24–25; Lord Suffield, *Considerations on the Game Laws* (London, 1825), p. 9, n.

effects.[19] Under such circumstances the poacher's dog could hardly expect much mercy. Spikes were set in the hare runs at just the height to permit the hare to slip past while the pursuing dog was impaled.

Harsh as these measures were, they by no means eradicated the poacher. When game was preserved abundantly in the midst of the rural population no legal authority could ever completely prevent poaching by those persons excluded from the chase by law. The single or individual poacher probably had the most success. It was easy for him to set a snare in the hedges; or to go out at night with a friend or two, a silent lurcher, and a net, and to carry off a covey of partridges before the season opened on the first of September; or to shoot a hare crossing his path or a pheasant outlined against the sky at night and then lie *perdu* when the keeper came. Men often became confirmed poachers of this sort, and were able by the exercise of their wits to make a living from the abundant game in spite of occasional sojourns in prison. These solitary poachers gave the keeper most of his trouble.

Gang poachers, however, attracted much more notice. In the early part of the eighteenth century they devoted their attention chiefly to the deer preserves in the parks and chases, because at that time the preservation of lesser game in large quantities had not progressed to an extent to make it attractive to them. A gang of desperate characters known as the Waltham Blacks so terrorized the region of Windsor and Berkshire that they stung the government into the enactment in 1723 of the harshest law of the game system. The Black Act, as it was called for more than one reason, made it a felony with the death penalty for anyone while disguised to kill deer illegally and even by an *ex post facto* clause threatened the same penalty on guilty persons who did not surrender and confess.[20]

Such severity, of course, proved no more successful in this than in other criminal laws. A month after the passage of the Black Act the old offenses were being committed as freely as ever.[21] Every deer enclosure

[19] William B. Daniel, *Rural Sports* (London, 1801–1802), I. 333–334; *Sporting Magazine*, VIII. (Sept., 1796) 325. Several local museums in England contain specimens of man traps, notably Eastgate House at Rochester where a savage trap is to be found, and the Dorset County museum at Dorchester.

[20] 9 Geo I., c. 22; continued by various acts and made permanent by 31 Geo. II., c. 42; superseded by 16 Geo. III., c. 30. The history of the Waltham Blacks can be followed in the newspapers of the day and also in G. M. Hughes, *A History of Windsor Forest, Sunninghill and the Great Park* (London, 1890), pp. 19 ff.

[21] London *Journal*, June 29, 1723; *The Weekly Journal; or, British Gazetteer*, same date.

continued to be the haunt of deer stealers throughout the century. The Duke of Newcastle, as warden of Sherwood Forest, was informed by a servant that "the lower sort of people on and about the forest, seeing so many hounds suffered, besides His Majesty's, to chace and kill the deer, take it for granted they may lend with the same impunity a helping hand towards their destruction. . . ".[22] Nor did the evil persist for want of legislation to curb it. A series of measures varying only slightly in the degree of their severity culminated in 1802 in an act of Parliament fixing the penalty on deer stealing at seven years' transportation, even for the first offense.[23] The increasing preservation of the game for the gun, a change which transformed the whole country into a kind of park, led to a great development of the poaching of smaller game.

Like the deer stealer the new poacher resorted to the gang device. In 1777 a gang pillaged the Earl of Buckinghamshire's pheasant nursery in Norfolk in open defiance of the keeper. Watchers at Windsor fought a sharp engagement with a gang who were waylaid while attending their snares set in the park.[24] By 1783 the new practice had become sufficiently general to occasion the publication of a pamphlet on the subject by a prominent justice of the peace, Henry Zouch. His alarming *Account of the Present Daring Practices of Night-Hunters and Poachers* showed them forming armed bodies at night and sweeping up the game, together with other property, in defiance of law and force. The farmers were terrified, and powerless to offer opposition. The annals of the last decade of the century make it clear that this practice was well established. Young men were trained by the experienced, and organizations were formed to coöperate in the paying of fines. Except for its illegitimate character the traffic might in some regions almost be said to have its apprentices and guilds.[25]

The ruling classes replied to this menace in their usual way by more and severer laws, not only by elaborating and defining closed seasons on game, but by setting up a series of specific poaching statutes which circumscribed the poacher's actions on every side, and laid heavy penalties

[22] R. Sutton to Duke of Newcastle, Newcastle Papers, British Museum, Add. MSS., 32, 713, fol. 237.

[23] 42 Geo. III., c. 107; *cf.* 10 Geo. II., c. 32; 27 Geo. II., c. 15; 16 Geo. III., c. 30; and 51 Geo. III., c. 120.

[24] Hist. MSS. Comm., *Report on the Lothian MSS.*, p. 320. *Gentleman's Magazine*, LI. (Dec., 1781) 591–592.

[25] Zouch, *Account*, pp. 1–6; *cf. Sporting Magazine*, III. (Jan., 1794) 216; XI. (Jan., 1798) 220; XV. (Mar., 1800) 319; *Annual Register*, XXXVII. (1795), Chronicle, pp. 29–30.

on his transgressions. By an act of 1770 killing game at night entailed a penalty of from three to six months' imprisonment and a public whipping. Sunday became a *dies non* for all sport. A law of 1773 made it possible to pay monetary fines in the place of the imprisonment and postponed the whipping to the third offense, but another of 1800 insured that gang poachers should be imprisoned for six months at hard labor and whipped at the pleasure of the quarter sessions.[26] As preventive measures these statutes proved totally ineffective. Gang poaching and the violence which accompanied it became every year more common. In 1805 Lord Suffield's gamekeepers at Gunton in Norfolk, armed only with sticks, fought a desperate battle with a gang carrying firearms.[27] The incident is only typical of what was happening generally.

Gang poaching and professional poaching depended upon the fact that game as a commodity commanded a ready sale. Townspeople who could afford it insisted on having it. Hostesses considered the game course indispensable at dinner. The privileged classes found that the most welcome gift they could give to their friends in town was game, and consequently there was a constant flow of these presents to the urban areas. Such quantities were sent to London at Lord Mayor's Day and Christmas that the coaching companies were obliged to provide special transportation facilities.[28] But this very legitimate traffic facilitated the illegimate, for game, by its very nature, was difficult to identify.

To deal with this problem the sale of game under any circumstances had been altogether prohibited since the reign of James I. As already remarked, poulterers, higglers, and such persons were particularly restricted in this respect.[29] But these laws could not be enforced. By a strange oversight Parliament had omitted to prohibit the purchase of game, and consequently qualified persons, who could legally possess game, could not be touched when they bought it, although the tradesman or poacher who sold it to them committed a penal act. And in any case game was in such universal demand and was so easy to dispose of that the traffic went on growing every year, *pari passu* with the increasing

[26] 10 Geo. III., c. 19; 13 Geo. III., c. 80; 39–40 Geo. III., c. 50. Christmas day was also a prohibited time from 1773. And a second offense in 1800 meant an extension of imprisonment to a maximum of two years. See 17 Geo. II., c. 5, referred to in the act of 1800.

[27] *Sporting Magazine*, XXV. (Jan. and Mar., 1805) 228, 339–340.

[28] Norfolk *Chronicle*, Dec. 22, 1787; see also John Ashton, *Dawn of the XIXth Century in England* (New York, 1886), II. 2; and *Universal Magazine*, XXXV. (Suppl., 1764) 375.

[29] See p. 242.

quantity of game in the preserves. It became a thriving business, in which poachers, wagoners, coachmen, and the town poulterers linked themselves together in a vast network.[30] It had become a regular trade in London before 1750. Under a plea of French origin, "Perigord Pyes", each containing four partridges, not less contraband for purporting to have come from outside England, were advertised for sale in London in 1784. Even English partridges figured in this open disregard of the law.[31]

In 1802 this trade, well established under the control of the Leadenhall Market poulterers and the porters at the inns who coöperated with the coachmen and guards, was a prosperous business. The poulterers stood ready to accept any quantity that came on the market. Two persons supplying them were said to have cleared a net profit of £1500 in two years. During the season the coffee houses and taverns everywhere served game, almost without a thought of its illegality.[32]

All this constant violation of the law, the poaching, the trespassing, the illegal selling of game, required the constant attention of the privileged classes. No other subject caused so much litigation and brought so many cases into the courts in the eighteenth century as did the game laws. The qualifications engendered constant dispute because no one knew what they meant. The qualification of being the eldest son of an esquire depended upon the definition of the term esquire, but the courts discovered that this was rather a title of courtesy than of law and could approach no nearer the solution than to decide that doctors of physic or captains of volunteers were not esquires.[33] And as for the disqualification of "inferiour Tradesmen Apprentices and other dissolute persons" definition was hopeless.

Aside from these more abstract legal questions it was in the vast array of petty local offenses that the game laws required the most attention. For this business the justice of the peace was the prime functionary. Local potentate, judge, and jury combined, he served as single justice, or, with his colleagues of the commission of the peace, in petty and quarter sessions, at a task which had been entrusted to him from the date of the very first qualification act in 1390. By the measure of 1671,

[30] William Taplin, *Observations on the Present State of the Game*, pp. 24–25; the gamekeepers constituted often an important link in the chain.

[31] *Morning Herald and Daily Advertiser*, Dec. 9, 1784, and see following issues.

[32] Daniel, *Rural Sports*, II. 427–428; *Sporting Magazine*, XIX. (Feb., 1802) 275; XXIV. (July, 1804) 174–175.

[33] Jones *v.* Smart, Durnford and East, *Term Reports*, I. 48–51; Talbot *v.* Eagle, Taunton, *Reports*, I. 510; *cf.* Mallock *v.* Eastley, *Modern Reports*, VII. 482–488.

offenders were to be convicted on the oath of a single witness given before a single justice of the peace. Persons stealing rabbits from unenclosed warrens he might punish by a penalty of treble damages and costs and imprisonment for three months. Gamekeepers armed with his warrants might search the premises of suspected persons. The game laws generally followed these principles. The single justice dealt with ordinary cases of deer stealing under the act of 1692, and might inflict such a considerable penalty as a year's imprisonment with exposure in the pillory. In most cases pecuniary penalties were provided for, with imprisonment in case of default, and this usually happened in the case of the ordinary poacher. Such an act as that of 1800 permitting the punishment of poachers as rogues and vagabonds put considerable power into the hands of the single justice.[34]

The more serious game offenses required a more solemn procedure, of course. The Black Act sent the suspected felon to the assizes for trial. Second offenses of deer stealing under the act of 1737, punishable by transportation, went to the justices of assize, also; and second offenses in ordinary poaching cases under the acts of 1773 and 1800 went to the quarter sessions.[35]

In the main, then, the game laws were administered by the justices of the peace. In their efficiency and their attitudes the magistrates varied widely. Generally they had little training or capacity for their work except for their experience varying with the period of their service and a smattering of legal knowledge picked up from Richard Burn's *Justice of the Peace*. Their views were usually narrow and their justice more rough than legal. They were chosen from the ruling class, the class which benefited by the game laws. It can be no cause for surprise, then, that they were regarded, and all too often with reason, as administering the game laws in harsh and arbitrary fashion.

The sporting squire bagged his birds in the morning and his poachers in the afternoon. He was said in 1828 to regard poaching and Methodism as equally wicked and both very much in the class of felony.[36] It was a widely held opinion that the country magistrates made it a paramount point of policy to levy the heaviest possible fines upon laborers who committed the heinous crime of killing hares or pheasants; "it very frequently happens", wrote one complainant, "that an epicure in game is a

[34] 13 Ric. II., c. 13; 22–23 Car. II., c. 25; 3 Wm. and Mary, c. 10, ss. 1, 3, 7; 39–40 Geo. III., c. 50.

[35] 9 Geo. I., c. 22; 10 Geo. II., c. 32, s. 8; 13 Geo. III., c. 80; 39–40 Geo. III., c. 50.

[36] *Annals of Sporting and Fancy Gazette*, XIII. (Jan., 1828) 52.

Justice of the Peace, and in this case he has every opportunity of maliciously indulging a sordid propensity, by rigidly inflicting the Game Laws in all their gross impurity".[37]

Cumulative penalties, which were perfectly legal, the justices of the assize discovered they could not frown down.[38] In 1786, the year after the passage of the first successful game certificate act, a poacher was fined a total of thirty-five pounds on the three counts of killing game while unqualified, doing so at night, and having no game certificate.[39] The employment of the common informer and conviction on the evidence of a single witness also led to abuse.

Worst of all, the justices of the peace sometimes did not scruple to hear cases concerning the game on their own lands. This practice was not looked upon generally as quite respectable and it would be difficult to say to what extent it was carried. In the nineteenth century justices often left the bench under such circumstances. And even in the eighteenth there is no reason to suppose that all magistrates were harsh and unreasonable, even though the system seems so now. Among lawyers at any rate it was a cause for complaint that many offenders received too slight punishment because the magistrate mitigated the sentence.[40] During a good part of the eighteenth century the higher courts maintained definitely a policy of watching strictly over summary judgments in game cases and taking care that they were not made arbitrarily.[41] But ultimately they definitely repudiated this view and maintained that, as the jurisdiction of summary procedure had been conferred upon the justices of the peace by the legislature, the courts ought to go to all reasonable lengths to support them.[42]

Abuse was the more easy because the whole game system was filled with confusion and uncertainty. The poacher could see no moral wrong in taking wild animals. Blackstone could be cited to show that animals *ferae naturae* belonged to the first taker—and conversely to show that they did not. The country gentlemen who expended their capital in breeding and preserving the pheasants for their amusement could not

[37] *Sporting Magazine*, XXIV. (June, 1804) 141–142.

[38] Edward Christian, *Treatise on the Game Laws* (London, 1821), pp. 168–169.

[39] *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. LVI., pt. 2 (Oct., 1786), p. 902.

[40] William Nelson, *The Laws of England Concerning the Game*, 2nd ed. (London, 1732), preface.

[41] R. *v.* Chandler (1702), Salkeld, *Reports*, I. 378; R. *v.* Corden (1769), Burrow, *Reports*, IV. 2279–2281.

[42] R. *v.* Thompson, Joseph Chitty, *Treatise on the Game Laws* (London, 1812), II. 1227.

understand such an attitude. The game code itself abounded in complexities, for almost none of the old game laws, stretching back into centuries of history, had been repealed; law had merely been piled on law, without any regard to simplicity. The game laws, it was said, constituted "the richest treasure a country attorney possesses".[43] And so the parlor of the magistrate swarmed with gamekeepers and poachers, trespassers and unqualified sportsmen. Even the qualified gentry, with a fine disregard of their own interests, transgressed habitually, shooting on each other's lands without permission, sporting on Sunday, and winking at the sport of their unqualified younger sons.

In the war on the poacher the squire often found himself the object of considerable hostility in his community. Both he and his gamekeeper seemed to play a rôle hardly distinguishable from that of the universally hated common informer. It is not surprising that he should cast about for some device by which he could at once divest himself of some of this unwelcome stigma and tighten up the loose joints of the rattling and lumbering game system. On several occasions members of the House of Commons invoked their parliamentary privilege as a means of protection. The last of these cases was that of Sir John Gibbons of Middlesex, who complained that a certain Thomas Smith and his servants entered his lands, assaulted him, and "killed his Game, although they were several times forbid to hunt there".[44] At best such a device could only be exceptional and was probably not used against the ordinary poacher. After 1762 it seems to have been abandoned, perhaps partly because of the rise of a new device of a more general character.

By banding together and pooling their resources in subscriptions to pay rewards to informers and for the expenses of prosecutions the gentlemen found they could work much more efficiently, and at the same time more impersonally, against their enemies. Such a form of organization was already common among the shopkeepers in London for protection against felons of all sorts. It appears to be impossible to ascertain how and when these game associations originated. Several parts of the country seem to have had them by 1750.[45] The Newcastle manuscripts show such an organization in process of formation in 1747 for the region of Nottingham. The agreement drawn up in that case reads as follows:

[43] *Sporting Magazine*, III. (Jan., 1794) 223–224.

[44] *Journals of the House of Commons*, XXIX. 369; the disposition of the case does not appear, but in previous cases which have been found (see *ibid.*, XXVI. 698; XXIX. 120, 212) definite action was taken; see also *ibid.*, XXIII. 505.

[45] *Thoughts on the Present Laws for Preserving the Game* (London, 1750), p. 27.

We whose names are hereunto subscribed, in order for the better preservation of the game within the county of Nottingham and for the discovery and bringing to justice all snarers of hares and drivers of partridges and every victualler, innkeeper, or other person exposing to sale any game, and all higlers and owners or drivers of any stage coach or waggon who shall be found carrying game within the said county against the laws and statutes of this realm and for defraying the expences attending the discovery and prosecution of any of the offenders aforesaid, do severally promise to pay the several sums by us subscribed into the hands of Mr. John Mason of East Retford and do likewise impower, authorise, and appoint Mr. John Whitaker, Mr. Edmund Kirke, and Mr. John Williamson, Attorneys at law, to sue and prosecute all such persons as shall be found offending herein. . . .

The Duke of Kingston subscribed twenty guineas for the purpose and Lord Galway five, with the remaining eight subscribers making up a total of sixty-four pounds. In pursuance of the object in view it was ordered that conveyances should be searched, and gentlemen were requested to label all parcels of game plainly in order to prevent any mistake about that sent by poachers.[46]

In 1752 there appeared a national organization along similar lines. The first advertisement of this Society of Noblemen and Gentlemen for the Preservation of the Game, published on February 29, indicates a recently formed body, still recruiting members. It ran:

The Society of Noblemen and Gentlemen for the Preservation of the Game, are desir'd to meet on Tuesday the 10th of March next, to dine at Four o'Clock, at the Star and Garter in Pall-Mall; when 'tis hop'd, such Noblemen and Gentlemen, who are willing to encourage this Undertaking, will meet the present Subscribers, or send their names to Mr. James Cecil in the Temple.[47]

The society, keeping the names of its subscribers concealed from the public eye, soon announced its resolution to invigorate the enforcement of the game laws in a very definite way. It set out to encourage informers, drew up a scale of rewards, set up a special watch in London and Westminster with a view to getting at the nub of the difficulty in the sale of game, and requested qualified persons to label all legitimate parcels of game with care to make deception more difficult.[48]

It was a considerable task which these "Noblemen and Gentlemen" had set themselves, but they proceeded with spirit. Apparently the law prohibiting the sale of game had been left almost totally unenforced for

[46] Newcastle MSS., British Museum, Add. MSS. 32, 713, ff. 227, 357. Whether the Duke of Newcastle paid is not indicated.

[47] *Daily Advertiser*, Feb. 29, Mar. 7, 1752; *cf. General Advertiser*, same date.

[48] *General Advertiser*, Mar. 14, 28, 1752.

many years and the action now taken looked very much like raking up obsolete statutes. More than fifty poulterers and higglers were at once haled into court for exposing game for sale. Prosecutions for a number of years rained upon the heads of the tradesmen and at a penalty of five pounds per head of game they found their trade quite interrupted. Sometimes they received mercy if they apologized and made promises for the future.[49] Far and wide through southern England the society carried its work. In some cases the most vexatious methods of prosecution were employed, for by suing for the penalties by action of debt in a court of record costs could be run up to overwhelming amounts and tradesmen ruined.[50] The laws were amended to facilitate this line of attack.

Such vigorous action aroused a loud outcry from the injured parties. It was said that the farmers were glad to be rid of the trespassing and marauding poachers but there is little reason to believe this was true. As early as March, 1752, placards appeared in the streets about the houses of Parliament declaring that if the society did not desist from its prosecutions the farmers and their laborers would destroy the game altogether.[51] In the eyes of its opponents the society became a menace to the liberties of Englishmen and an engine of oppression; during the Seven Years' War pamphleteers began to ask with a somewhat strained eloquence what value there was in British freedom if one could not shoot a hare or a partridge.[52]

Nevertheless the Society of Noblemen and Gentlemen continued in existence at least down to 1790.[53] In the course of time its vigor declined, though certainly not the game traffic which had called it forth. In addition there continued to exist the regional associations out of which the general organization had originated. They were adaptable to local conditions and no doubt served often more satisfactorily than the society of London. A local game association existed in Hampshire in 1769, and at least one and perhaps two in Norfolk in the 1780's.[54] Such associations

[49] *Daily Advertiser,* Feb. 24, 1752. *General Advertiser,* Mar. 28 (letter from "Benevolus"), June 2, 1752; *Public Advertiser,* Jan. 30, 1754.

[50] *Some Considerations on the Game Laws and the Present Practice* (London, 1753), pp. 12–14; 26 Geo. II., c. 2.

[51] *Daily Advertiser,* Mar. 13, 1752.

[52] For examples see *Some Considerations on the Game Laws and the Present Practice,* pp. 12–16, 18–23; *Remarks on the Laws Relating to the Game and the Association* (London, 1753), pp. 15–17; *An Alarm to the People of England* (London, 1757).

[53] *Public Advertiser,* during the period.

[54] Norfolk *Chronicle,* Nov. 4, 1786, and following dates to 1789 (particularly July 25, 1789), and Norwich *Mercury,* Aug. 1, 1789, etc.

show to what an extent the game system was a mixture of governmental machinery and private initiative. The government supplied justices of the peace, laws, and the framework of justice; but much, in the form of gamekeepers and prosecutions, assisted by the game associations, was left to the activity of those interested.

Still another device for enforcement the ruling class found in taxation. When William Pitt in 1784 introduced his measure for the levying of a stamp tax on gamekeepers' deputations and the right to kill game he probably had in mind only the production of revenue for the government. He was taxing everything he could think of and the game privilege seemed convenient. But most sportsmen looked upon the new duty as a new game qualification, a game law pure and simple. Captain Berkeley eagerly suggested that the tax be made, not two guineas, but five. Such a welcome had rarely been given to a tax. The bill as passed, laying a tax of two guineas on persons qualified to kill game, who were required to secure a properly stamped certificate, and a tax of half a guinea on gamekeepers' deputations, proved quite unworkable through faulty drafting, but a more practical measure was enacted in 1785 with the tax set at the same rates.[55]

From that date forward, therefore, there existed in addition to the qualifications established during the last three decades of the seventeenth century a new qualification in the form of a game tax. It meant that the government became more interested than ever before in the game system. The poacher had now in the stamp office another enemy. And the financial success of the measure led to further taxes, while defects were ironed out to insure efficiency in the collection.[56] The cost of the certificate was increased in 1791 to three guineas.[57] Similarly a tax on dogs was established in 1796, and by 1812 it had risen to substantial rates which could not but serve as a restriction on sport.[58]

In these constant and desperate efforts at once to exercise their privileges to the fullest degree and to destroy the pernicious game traffic the governing classes showed little consideration for the farmer. Pestered with poachers, who, in stealing game, acquired somewhat loose ideas of

[55] *Parliamentary Register,* XVI. (1784) 214. The statute is 24 Geo. III., c. 43. It was never printed. The original is in the Public Record Office, Parliament Rolls, no. 1127. 25 Geo. III., c. 50.

[56] See, for example, 26 Geo. III., c. 82.

[57] Of gamekeepers to one guinea; 31 Geo. III., c. 21. See also subsequent acts: 48 Geo. III., c. 55, schedule L; 54 Geo. III., c. 141.

[58] 36 Geo. III., c. 124; 52 Geo. III., c. 93, schedule G. *Cf. Annual Register,* LIV. (1812) [106–107].

private property, and on the other hand burdened with the support of game and the sufferance of a general trespass by sportsmen, he occupied an uncomfortable middle position in the game system. Most farmers lacked the necessary qualification to come within the privileged class. Freeholders who possessed land giving a hundred pounds of income annually usually rented their lands to tenants, and with the rapid spread of the enclosure movement and the engrossment of the land into large estates the few farming freeholders who had qualifications declined correspondingly. As for ninety-nine year leaseholds there were few at best and not many of them would yield the necessary £150 income. And even with a qualification the tenant could rarely kill game on the land he occupied because the landlords made it a practice to reserve the game specifically to themselves.[59]

The freeholder just within the restrictions of the law resented the game system bitterly. A few pounds seemed to make all the difference in his social position. One farmer in Devonshire, who had a freehold of eighty pounds and a short leasehold of one hundred and thirty pounds decided he was in a state of slavery on his own land and sold out to seek better fortune in America.[60] The tenant, as contrasted with the freeholder, was more likely to make friends with the poacher and carry on a surreptitious war against the game. A Norfolk man expressed the farmer's view in 1794 in these words:

> I rent between 3 and 400 *l.* a year, and have a freehold of about 3 or 4 score more, and yet dare not keep a greyhound to follow at my heels, about my land, nor a gun to shoot a partridge or a pheasant for my longing wife, but shall be severely trounced by my next great neighbour; whilst his game-keeper, who is one generally picked out for one of the best shots in the county, shall load his table with game, and some to spare for your town poulterers; but, my poor son Tom, if found with a fowling-piece in his hand, though it is only to kill a crow that is pecking my lamb's eyes out, his gun shall be taken from him by this saucy game-keeper, and severely rebuked into the bargain by the squire. Now the squire himself never takes a gun in hand. . . . 'tis as hard I think, that we farmers, who have bred up a good store of this game, must be wholly denied a little recreation at some of our leisure times, which certainly are but few. . . .[61]

It was not merely a question of pride with the farmer. The game laws affected him in a very material way. With the increasing preserva-

[59] Edward Christian, *Treatise on the Game Laws*, pp. 112–113, 238; William Marshall, *The Rural Economy of Norfolk* (London, 1787), I. 67, 73, 76.

[60] *Gentleman's Magazine*, XL. (March, 1770) 122.

[61] *Sporting Magazine*, IV. (Aug., 1794) 251. *Cf. Monthly Review*, XXXII. (May, 1765) 391.

tion he found his land swarming with game, not a head of which he could touch, but which nevertheless attacked his crops with a voraciousness hardly to be imagined. The winged game returned some compensation by the insects which it consumed, but in the high state of preservation which appeared late in the century there was room for doubt whether the farmer reaped any ultimate advantage. As for rabbits and hares little benefit could be discovered to offset their ravages.

As early as 1753 farmers were declaring that a brace of hares did damage more than equal to the cost of maintaining two sheep. During the Seven Years' War the scarcity of food was laid plausibly to the destructive game.[62] William Marshall, an agricultural reformer and a close observer, in his *Rural Economy of Norfolk* described an appalling waste. The hares, he declared, not only ate the turnips but by biting little bits out of them caused great quantities to decay. Wheat, barley, and clover they destroyed wholesale by making tracks through the grain and eating the young shoots so that they could not come to vigorous maturity. The pheasants preyed upon the wheat from the time it was sown to the time of harvest, and even followed the grain into the barn. By pecking out the heart of the clover they deranged the whole management of the farms, as this new forage crop played a crucially important part in the new methods of agriculture. "To a person who has not been eye-witness to the destruction which accompanies an inordinate quantity of game", he wrote, "the quantity of damage is in a manner inconceivable." [63]

And the tenant had no remedy. If he interfered with the game or killed it he was haled before the justice of the peace, perhaps his own landlord, or else his lease was forfeit. He might surreptitiously tread in the nest of pheasant or partridge eggs when he found it or give the poachers secretly to understand that he would not interfere with them, but such measures were obviously unsatisfactory. In the view of the landlords he could depart if he found his bargain unsatisfactory. But if he were tied by a lease and the game increased out of all proportion to what he had bargained for he was caught in a ruinous position with no remedy. Tradition usually kept him on the farm until he was bankrupt or the landlord changed his policy. Nor did the unqualified freeholder fare much better. The small freehold in a preserving country, surrounded by coverts, was often overrun with swarms of game which the owner could not touch. He could invite qualified sportsmen to kill

[62] *Some Considerations on the Game Laws and the Present Practice*, pp. 36–37. *Public Advertiser*, Feb. 10, 1757.

[63] *Rural Economy of Norfolk*, I. 171–178.

the pests and in one case in 1811 this was done. But such a policy could only lead to collisions with the powerful.[64]

Not only did the game run at will over the farmer's land but the sportsmen as well. The gamekeeper and the landlord, who showed more or less respect for growing crops and hedges as the relations with the tenant were more or less cordial, came as a matter of course. In addition came shooters, fox hunters, and sportsmen of every sort, freely striding through the fields, plowing through the hedges, opening gates, and generally irritating the farmer and damaging his property. As he could hardly trail everyone of these he could not usually fasten any particular piece of damage to any one offender. And the trespass law gave him very little assistance, for an Elizabethan statute had provided that unless damages awarded in trespass cases equaled forty shillings the plaintiff should be awarded no more costs than the amount of damage.[65] Hence it was likely to prove an unprofitable proceeding to sue the ordinary trespasser.

In the time of William III. the legislature had made some slight improvement in these arrangements by provision that if the trial judge would certify the offense to have been willful and malicious the plaintiff should receive full costs. By warning a trespasser not to repeat his offense farmers found they could receive the benefit of this measure. For the judges customarily certified second offenses under such circumstances as willful and malicious.[66] Nevertheless such machinery was clumsy and uncertain and the trespass evil continued unabated. Farmers could scold trespassers but the qualified sportsmen cared very little for that. It was only the game preservers who made much use of the notice not to trespass.

The opening of the partridge season on the first of September caused special damage in wet seasons. The shooters with their pointers, quartering the fields before the harvest could be got in, wrought havoc with the standing grain. The "mean, base, scandalous practice" of shooting in standing corn was, like other evils, universally condemned, but, in the excitement of the sport, continually carried on.[67] In 1796 Thomas Coke secured the passage through Parliament of a bill postponing the open-

[64] *Annual Register*, LIII. (1811) 128; *cf. Sporting Magazine*, XLI. (Oct., 1812) 13–14; and Daniel, *Supplement to the Rural Sports* (London, 1813), p. 414.

[65] 43 Eliz., c. 6; Christian, *Treatise*, p. 93.

[66] 8–9 Wm. III., c. 11, s. 4; Christian, *Treatise*, p. 93. In 1803 the court held (contrary to the doctrine in Reynolds *v.* Edwards, 1794) that the court could not be compelled to certify merely because previous notice not to trespass was proved (Good *v.* Watkins, East, *Reports*, III. 495–496).

[67] *Public Advertiser*, Sept. 24, 1755.

ing of the partridge season until the fifteenth of September. But three years later the landlords relapsed from their self-denying ordinance and the old date was reëstablished.[68]

To crown these absurdities the hunters stoutly maintained that as long as they hunted the fox they had a right to go anywhere. Foxes, they declared, are vermin and the law justifies a trespass in pursuit of vermin as a public benefit. Blackstone's *Commentaries* and Richard Burn's *Justice of the Peace* supported them with citations of old law cases.[69] As late as 1786 the court of king's bench in the case of Gundry *v.* Feltham declared that a man could legally follow a fox on the lands of another in order to kill it.[70] This seemed to settle the question for once and all. The *Gentleman's Magazine* broadcast the news among the country gentlemen that their fox hunting had full validity in the eyes of the law.

The difficulty lay in the fact that the decision left them in an absurdly false position. Blackstone's theory had rested on the supposition that fox hunters benefited the public by killing noxious animals. In the seventeenth century there had been some truth in this idea, but it was manifestly contrary to fact in 1786. It was ridiculous to maintain that the fine gentlemen came out from London and from their country mansions dressed in their brilliant hunting costumes, maintained costly hunting stables, and subscribed to the heavy expenses of high-bred packs of hounds all out of a sense of public duty. In fact they took every measure of encouragement and coercion to make sure that the supply of foxes continued and even not infrequently saved foxes at the end of a run in order to have them for future sport. And, most inconsistently of all, the gentlemen insisted on having a monopoly of fox killing, and considered it outrageous for a gamekeeper or a farmer to shoot a fox with a gun. Such a doctrine put the fox on an even higher plane than the stag, for no one suggested that stag hunters could do what fox hunters could do.

The craven farmers submitted to the fox hunting gospel, but if the pursuers of the brush had read a little more carefully the decision of the courts in 1786 and had considered the position of the game preservers and the rise of valuable country estates in the vicinity of London they would not have felt so sure of themselves as they did. The court in its

[68] 36 Geo. III., c. 39; London *Times*, Feb. 17, 1796. 39 Geo. III., c. 34; see also Public Record Office, Home Office Papers, H. O. 42/152, R. W. Torin to Lord Sidmouth, July 25, 1816.

[69] William Blackstone, *Commentaries* (London, 1764–1769), III. 213–214; Burn, *Justice of the Peace*, 1st ed. (London, 1755), I. 438. *Cf.* the same false view in Russell M. Garnier, *History of the English Landed Interest* (London, 1893), II. 469. For cases see, for example, Gedge *v.* Minne, Bulstrode, *Reports*, II. 61.

[70] Durnford and East, *Term Reports*, I. 334, 337.

opinion had taken great pains, to which no one paid any attention at the time, to state that it expressed no views beyond the doctrine that it was legal to follow a fox onto another man's land. It definitely refused to answer the question which had not then been asked: Did fox hunting constitute a legal method of doing so? Those sportsmen who preserved game but did not also hunt foxes had to face this question, for they were never so foolish as to believe the myth that foxes had no taste for hares or pheasants. And the owners of highly developed and expensively laid out country estates and show places in Herts and near London discovered that it concerned them very much also.

Thus it was Lord Essex, owner of Cashiobury Park in Hertfordshire, who secured in 1809 a decision by Lord Ellenborough that trespass by fox hunters was as illegal as any other.[71] The legal point was settled but the decision did not put an end to fox hunting, which was enabled to continue with an ever increasing popularity through the existence of large estates. And the farmer received no benefit. The hunters and shooters went their way as if nothing had happened. The landlords insisted on their tenants showing every consideration to the hunts and the foxes, and continued to flood the fields with their hares and pheasants as the battue demanded.

Clearly this system of privilege could not avoid arousing opposition.[72] Almost every excluded class was its enemy, the laborers, most farmers, the tradesmen, and the unqualified game eaters of the towns. The discontent has left little trace in the period before large scale game preservation. But when the Society of Noblemen and Gentlemen in the 'fifties undertook to inject into the game system a rigor and severity which had been lacking previously, a considerable outcry arose.[73] The radical doctrines of the day easily suggested that all men had a natural right to kill game wherever they found it and it became possible during the Seven Years' War to publish such doggerel verse as this:

> What's liberty to me? 'Tis lost! 'Tis gone!
> If I must be oppress'd, it matters not
> Who are th' oppressors. Shall I hazard life
> For those imperious Lordlings, who deny'd
> That privilege, which Heaven and Nature meant
> For food, or sport, or exercise to all? [74]

[71] The case is that of Essex *v.* Capel. *Annual Register*, LI. (1809) 370–372; Chitty, *Treatise on the Game Laws*, II. 1382.

[72] No attempt is made here to go fully into the rise of discontent with the game system.

[73] See *ante*, p. 255.

[74] *Universal Magazine*, XIX. (Aug., 1756) 59–60.

In 1796 Charles Fox's friend, John Christian Curwen, brought the matter of game law reform before the House of Commons. But the debate on that occasion was hardly more than academic. The opposition to the game system, general though it was, had no organization and no driving power. The farmers had not developed their political consciousness, and, even if they had, they were not united. Some were qualified to kill game and others were devotees of fox hunting, which required no qualification. The town classes were not yet sufficiently concerned to take any action. In short the privileged classes remained in the saddle, hardly threatened as yet in their exclusive sporting rights. Indeed, so secure did they seem that they were able to add to the game system continually throughout the eighteenth century, enacting new and severer poaching acts, and writing into the law a new qualification in the form of the game tax. If they could have perceived the consequences of their acts they would doubtless have hesitated. For in the tax on sport they had introduced a new principle, which, while not based upon the idea of equality, nevertheless seemed in a capitalistic society such as England was rapidly becoming, more just than the old system. Ultimately the tax principle was to prove victorious. But it was not until 1831 that the new forces were to secure the reform of the old privileges, and even then with somewhat doubtful results.

During the eighteenth century the country gentlemen reigned supreme. Their game system, part and parcel of the social and political structure of the time, is one of their most significant institutions. If one may judge by the figures of the returns from the game tax and make a few algebraic calculations it would appear that the sporting system was maintained for the benefit of something like twenty or thirty thousand persons, exclusive of gamekeepers.[75] Yet they were able to cling to it and even to elaborate it. Very few other institutions seemed to most of them so important. And certainly few had more ramifications, social, economic, or political.

CHESTER KIRBY.

Brown University.

[75] The calculations are too long to give here but they are based upon the tax returns for 1795 judged in the light of other years, and the supposition that gamekeepers and sportsmen were in the proportion approximately of one to two (judging by lists of persons taking out game certificates in Norfolk). There is no way of making more than the roughest possible calculation.

THE REACTION OF BRITISH LABOR TO THE POLICIES OF PRESIDENT WILSON DURING THE WORLD WAR

THE outbreak of the World War forced the representatives of British Labor, like their comrades on the Continent, to choose whether they would stand by their pacific internationalism, as expressed in party programs and at international congresses, or rally to the patriotic slogans of national defense. In Great Britain, as elsewhere, Labor split on the issue. On the extreme right a minority became violently nationalistic; the great center majority supported the official view of the war and agreed to suspend the political and economic struggle against their class opponents; on the left a smaller group, morally opposed to war, very early manifested a primary interest in the peace issue and in the revival of internationalism. Although soon to be strong on the Continent, the voices in Great Britain in favor of transforming the "imperialist war" into a class struggle in order to promote the world revolution were so weak as to pass almost unheard. These internal dissensions, the collapse of the socialist and trade union internationals, and the abnormal psychological and political conditions of war time forced British Labor virtually to suspend the advocacy of its traditional ideals.[1] Restive under this restraint, Labor opinion became particularly sensitive to the pronouncements and policies of the chief executive of the one great power which had not been swept into the conflict.

British Labor's reaction to President Wilson's policies passed through

[1] At the outbreak of the war the British Labor party was a federal body. Its numerical strength was based on the trade unions, led by Arthur Henderson, J. R. Clynes, and J. H. Thomas. The other components were local groups, the Women's Labor League, and the Socialist societies. In the last were to be found not more than two per cent. of Labor's voting strength, but their influence was far out of proportion to their numbers. The few thousand members of the Fabian Society supported the war as a battle for democracy. The Independent Labor party (the I. L. P.) with Keir Hardie, Ramsay MacDonald, and Philip Snowden in its ranks had a membership of about thirty thousand. The majority, while not actively opposing the war, were most interested in working for peace. The smaller orthodox Marxian British Socialist party (the B. S. P.) suffered a split in which the members went to the two extremes. The increasing pacifism of the majority led in March, 1916, to the secession of a considerable section, including the veteran H. M. Hyndman, who founded a new pro-war National Socialist party.

Note: The materials used in the preparation of this article, as in the author's British Labor and the War-Time Coalitions, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXV. 522–541, are in the Hoover War Library, Stanford University, California.

several phases. The President's efforts to maintain American neutrality aroused critical and even cynical comment, especially on the part of the majority who were still primarily concerned with the defense of national interests against the overshadowing threat of German military successes. A new and highly significant phase began in May, 1916, with Wilson's espousal of the cause of a league of nations. Labor responded to the idealism of this "peace aim", which contrasted vividly with the vague and pedestrian pronouncements of official war aims. Socialist and left elements generally warmed to his championship of a new international organization. They welcomed his efforts at mediation between the belligerents and greeted with enthusiasm his speech on "peace without victory". The entrance of the United States into the war and the first Russian Revolution in 1917 created a new situation. The British Labor majority was completely converted from its earlier reserve and approved Wilson's championship of the Allied cause. The left, however, more clearly reflecting the growing war weariness and disillusionment, was discouraged by his apostasy from the cause of peace. The peace program of the Russian Soviet, dominated at this time by moderate Socialists, was more in tune with the British Labor left than the President's efforts to mobilize America's full powers against the enemy. By the end of 1917 the military disasters of that year, the cumulative effect of war-time restrictions and privations, the armistice on the Eastern Front, and the publication in Petrograd of the secret treaties of the Allies all emphasized the dubious inadequacy of official war aims and stimulated the demand for peace or, alternatively, a peace program to justify longer endurance of the burden of war. Wilson's Fourteen Points provided this program and initiated a new phase in the attitude of British Labor. This famous pronouncement, as well as subsequent ones, included many points previously advocated by sections of the Labor party. The President, however, was the first in high position to bring these aspirations into the realm of practical politics. His program gained further force when the Bolsheviks' peace gesture was thrust aside by the mailed fist at Brest-Litovsk. British Labor, accordingly, rose to Wilson's eloquent leadership and found itself marching with the liberal and labor groups of allied and enemy states alike in support of the ideal of a just peace and a new international order.

While attention was absorbed in the effort to repel the German thrust at Paris, it was quite natural that Labor spokesmen should say little about the attitude of the United States. It was assumed that President Wilson would follow the traditional policy of neutrality, so that his

proclamation of August 4 was taken as a matter of course. When it was reënforced two weeks later by an appeal for neutrality "in fact as well as in name", the Fabian *New Statesman* approved the touch of idealism and hoped that nothing would impair it. That journal recognized the potentialities of the United States, however, and ventured a prediction that, as the weeks went by, the attention of all the warring powers would become more and more centered upon the leading neutral state and that the future of the world might well depend upon decisions made at Washington.[2]

As the war progressed and the United States daily became more involved, there was friction with both belligerents over questions of contraband and of cargoes bound for neutral European ports. Since the British navy controlled the seas, American grievances against that power seemed the greater. Protests were made of which the first significant enough to rouse comment was that of December 26, 1914. The pro-war Labor press greeted it wth considerable irony and sarcasm. It was said that the President was willing to protest in the name of international law where moneyed interests were concerned but kept silence upon the flagrant breaches in Belgium. Undefended cities might be bombarded, art treasures destroyed, and Hague conventions scrapped, but not till dollars were threatened would he raise his voice in protest. A facile explanation was found in the efficacy of enemy propaganda, the influence of German-Americans, and the cupidity of big business. "The inspiration of the Note is German—it is on this particular subject that the German-American press has been concentrating for the past two months", said the *New Statesman,* adding that "it is not to be supposed that the American financial interests affected required much artificial stimulation". Many lengthy articles appeared on the number of unassimilated citizens of Teutonic origin in the United States and their supposed influence on the President. American politics were frequently portrayed as a contest between two groups of "hyphenates", the pro-Ally and the pro-German. However desirous Wilson might be of steering a course between them, he was certain to be attacked by the one as timid before Germany and by the other as subservient to the Allies. If in the main his policy had not actually impeded the Allies, it was because the former group was slightly the stronger, but in the case of the present note it was believed that his hand had been forced by the pro-Germans.[3]

[2] *New Statesman,* Sept. 5, 1914.

[3] *New Statesman,* Jan. 2–Apr. 10, 1915; *New Age,* Jan. 7–May 8, 1915; *Federationist,* Feb., 1915.

While the early months of the war saw Wilson insisting upon the full preservation of American property rights, mostly against Great Britain, there followed a period when the safety of American lives was the chief object of solicitude. Here Germany was the offender. The early part of 1915 witnessed a submarine campaign which evidenced the terrible significance of that weapon to neutrals and belligerents alike. The patriotic Labor press was impatient with Wilson's tardiness to act. The *Seaman,* organ of a union whose members had first-hand acquaintance with the German methods, attributed it to German influence. The *New Statesman* criticized the selfishness of a point of view that was silent while the ships of weak neutrals were sunk, and became vocal only when its own nationals suffered. When the *Lusitania* went down, the *New Age* said that America by her pusillanimity was forfeiting the esteem of the world. From the left wing *Forward* came the thrust that the United States was not even on the verge of taking any decisive step, because to do so would threaten the profits accruing from the steadily increasing volume of munitions orders. In Wilson's three notes was seen a determination to avoid hostilities at any cost. The last one of July 21, 1915, was resented as double-edged, for the President not only stated that German naval commanders had demonstrated that submarines could be operated in substantial accord with the accepted practices of naval warfare, but also that the United States and Germany were both contending for the freedom of the seas. The invitation to the German government to practical coöperation on this question, "at this time when coöperation may accomplish most", evoked resentful comments from British journals. When in the following month the *Arabic* was sunk the *Seaman* said the neutrality of America was fast becoming the disgust of humanity. Wilson's notes on the submarine issue, in fact, had few friendly reactions until on September 1, 1915, the German government gave its general pledge that its submarines would not sink liners without warning and without safeguarding the lives of noncombatants. The President's patience and forbearance were thereupon suddenly seen in a new light. A few days later, accordingly, his action in requesting the recall of the Austro-Hungarian ambassador was given a most favorable interpretation. On any crucial issue, it was now said, his poise and circumspection reacted on the national nerves like a sedative. A Roosevelt would have forced matters to a climax after the *Lusitania* sinking but would have divided the country, while Wilson, with methods slower and more patient, but not less resolute, was assuring himself in advance of the whole-hearted support of the people. Whenever he should be driven to

announce that diplomacy had done its utmost and that the ultimate decision rested with Congress, he would find a united American nation ready to follow his lead.[4]

After December, 1915, President Wilson was concerned with the problem of national defense. On December 7 he broached to Congress his preparedness plan, which in January and February, 1916, was followed by a speaking tour. Some observers saw in this move a recognition of military weakness as the cause of impotence in the face of German aggression, but did not believe that it would be followed by any decisive action. As the months wore on without change in the diplomatic situation, it was labeled a political maneuver to steal some Rooseveltian thunder for election purposes and, therefore, for home consumption only.[5] The Socialist minority on the left, however, was disappointed in what apparently was a surrender to the jingoes. In preparedness they saw the machinations of greedy, unscrupulous armament rings. By blessing the movement, Wilson, they feared, would destroy his qualifications to act as a peacemaker between the belligerents.[6]

On February 10, 1916, the Central Powers announced that after the end of the month their submarine commanders would be instructed to sink any armed merchant vessel, whether carrying passengers or not. On March 24 the *Sussex* was sunk. Would Wilson act? A widespread opinion anticipated a repetition of the "procrastinating inquiries" of the previous year, but when at last on April 27 the President spoke in his ultimatum, which carried a threat to sever diplomatic relations, there was a chorus of approval. His messages and speeches were cheered as "stinging neutral rebukes" which would carry weight with all non-belligerents. He was now credited with prevision during the preparedness campaign, for in retrospect his speeches seemed to have in view just such a crisis as the present. When in May the German government yielded, a great victory was conceded. Germany had surrendered at the point of President Wilson's sword as soon as she was sure it was really out of the scabbard.[7]

Meanwhile the disputes between Great Britain and the United States, less acute than the submarine issue because only property and not life was involved, intermittently attracted attention from the Labor press.

[4] *New Statesman*, Mar. 20, July 31, Sept. 11–25, 1915; *New Age*, May 13, 1915; *Seaman*, Feb. 26, Aug. 27, 1915; Glasgow *Forward*, May 22, 1915.

[5] *New Statesman*, Dec. 11, 1915–Feb. 5, 1916; *New Age*, Feb. 10, 1916.

[6] *Labour Leader*, June 1, Aug. 17, Sept. 28, 1916; *Forward*, Sept. 2, 1916; *Socialist Review*, Jan.–Mar., 1916, pp. 51 ff.

[7] *New Age*, Apr. 27, 1916; *New Statesman*, Mar. 4–May 20, 1916.

A note of October 21, 1915, insisted that the British orders in council were violating basic principles of international law. The direct language of the American President was generally deemed unfriendly in tone. He was accused of undue regard for the letter of the law, of pettifogging over insignificant details, of concentrating upon obsolete textbook rules which ignored totally changed conditions of warfare, and of playing for anti-British votes in the next election. Wilson's protests against the British "black list" of certain American firms were minimized in importance by claims that even pro-Ally groups in the United States believed that, in order to prove impartial neutrality, it was necessary to criticize both belligerents and sometimes, as in this case, to make mountains out of molehills. Always there were thrusts at the "sordidness" of the United States as a country where war wealth was blinding people to the fundamental issues involved in the great conflict. The readiness to float Allied loans was contrasted with the reluctance to make the necessary sacrifice to save civilization. Commercialism had killed chivalry in America and had produced only a disappointing neutrality which more and more appeared the indifference of the Levite and the priest, who passed by while a neighbor was being butchered and outraged.[8]

Sometime in 1915 it became apparent that the American President was persuaded that, when the time came to discuss peace, the United States, as the most important neutral, would have a great task to perform. Such a possibility accorded ill with the temper of the belligerent Laborites, who were too disappointed with the "timid neutrals" to permit one to influence a peace program. A year later, however, the President's open espousal of the cause of a league of nations aroused the admiration of the idealists of the party. His speech of May 27, 1916, before the League to Enforce Peace was immediately recognized as of first importance. World organization was a cause in which British Labor had already done much pioneering. Now they felt grateful to President Wilson for definitely bringing it into the realm of practical politics. It was of the utmost significance that the chief executive of a great power had publicly proclaimed his adherence to the proposal for a league and it was hoped that the British government would welcome his lead. Especially pleased was the radical left. The speech, it was said, marked a new era in international relationships. "It is certainly a great advance upon any suggestion put forward in a responsible way by the head of any

[8] *New Statesman*, Oct. 9, Nov. 13, 1915, Nov. 18, 1916; *New Age*, Nov. 18, 1915, Mar. 16, 1916; *Clarion*, Dec. 10, 1915, June 2, Sept. 15, Nov. 3, 1916; *Scottish Cooperator*, Jan. 28, Nov. 24, 1916.

Government in modern times", said the *Labour Leader.* At the next annual conference of the Labor party in January, 1917, a resolution was carried unanimously to work for an international league to enforce the maintenance of the peace on the plan advocated by the President of the United States.[9] By coming forward as the champion of the cause which so vitally interested Labor, President Wilson took the first step toward putting himself at the head of their forces. There were, to be sure, a few discordant notes from extremists of both right and left. A small right wing organization, the British Workers' League, hoped America would remain neutral and aloof in order that at the final council table there would be no moderating influence in dealing with the enemy of liberty and civilization. They desired no German-American "Rosenbaum or Hoffenmeyer" present in the guise of American diplomats to rob the Allies of the fruits of victory and expressed doubts that America would enter the proposed league. At the other extreme the equally small Marxian British Socialist party, although paying tribute to Wilson's personal honesty and disinterestedness, avowed that a capitalist league to enforce peace stood as much chance of realization as a thieves league to enforce honesty.[10]

In these years while the press that voiced—and created—majority opinion was critical of Wilson and frequently inclined to be cynical in its interpretation of American neutrality, that of the left wing Socialist minority was consistently friendly. Although never actively opposing the war, the I. L. P. and kindred groups were primarily interested in the peace issue. Long before any utterances of the American President warranted expectation of support for their purpose, his very position predisposed them to look hopefully toward him. Since the Allied governments were absorbed in the military situation, any effective peace move would have to come from elsewhere. It was logical, accordingly, to expect it from the head of the greatest neutral state. Upon him they centered their aspirations for an early and decent settlement.

On July 4, 1915, there appeared in the New York *Tribune* an appeal headed " 'Save the World!'—An Englishman to Wilson", which deeply stirred the Socialist elements of Great Britain. It was from the pen of E. D. Morel, a pacifist Liberal, already closely associated with Ramsay MacDonald and kindred spirits in the Union of Democratic Control and

[9] *New Statesman,* May 8, 1915, June 3, Oct. 28, 1916; *Federationist,* Mar., 1917; *Labour Leader,* June 8, 1916; *Bradford Pioneer,* Feb. 9, 1917; *Report of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1917), p. 134.

[10] *British Citizen and Empire Worker,* Nov. 11, Dec. 30, 1916; *Federationist,* Dec., 1916; *Call,* Nov. 9, 1916, Feb. 1, 1917.

soon to enter the ranks of Labor. Morel was a sincere idealist, who conceived of the situation as a tragic one in which the warring peoples desired peace but, because unable to influence their rulers, must look elsewhere for initiative and leadership. "In the two hemispheres", he wrote, "there is one man, and only one man, who, by his character and through the great position he enjoys, can save the soul of the peoples and of the governments of Europe. That man is President Wilson."[11]

With such sentiments the left wing was fully in accord and never ceased to hope that President Wilson would intervene. His espousal of the League to Enforce Peace in the speech of May 27, 1916, aroused the liveliest anticipations of early mediation. When Wilson avowed his belief in such fundamentals as the right of a people to choose the sovereignty under which they would live, the rights of small states to have their independence and territorial integrity respected, and the right of the world to be free from every disturbance of its peace that had its origin in aggression, it seemed almost that he was adopting the program of the so-called pacifist section of British Labor.[12] To Bruce Glasier, editor of the *Socialist Review*, it seemed that "among all the rulers of the world today, he [President Wilson] appears . . . to have shown the loftiest appreciation of the new ideals of world citizenship". As during 1916 President Wilson continued to expound the principles for which America stood and her duty to play a high part if necessary, he found his most ardent supporters in the Labor left. Of all the elements in the party they were happiest in his reëlection. The victory at the polls was interpreted as the repulse of the militarist "Prussians of the type of Mr.

[11] New York *Tribune*, July 4, 1915; *Bradford Pioneer*, Sept. 17, 1915; Glasgow *Forward*, Sept. 25, 1915.

[12] The first peace program of the I. L. P. was formulated at the annual conference of April 5–6, 1915. Its four points given below will be recognized as essentially the same as some later advanced by President Wilson. "In order that the peace may be just and lasting the conference demands:

(a) That the people concerned shall give consent before there is transfer of territory;

(b) No further treaty, agreement, or understanding be entered into without the knowledge of the people and the consent of Parliament, and machinery to be created for the democratic control of foreign policy;

(c) Drastic all-round reduction of armaments by international agreement, together with the nationalization of the manufacture of armaments, and the national control of the export of armaments by one country to another;

(d) British foreign policy to be directed in future toward establishing a federation of the nations, and the setting up of an International Council, whose decisions shall be public, together with the establishment of courts for the interpretation and enforcement of treaties and international law." *Report of the Twenty-third Annual Conference of the Independent Labour Party* (1915), p. 88.

Roosevelt", who probably would have led the country straight into the war. It was gratifying to know he was in office for the period that would doubtless see the war ended and the peace conference at work.[13]

Wilson's summons to the belligerents on December 18, 1916, to state definitely their peace terms in order that the world might know and compare them was not well received by the more warlike Labor journals, nor by the Allied press generally. It was objected that the time was not ripe. "A premature or inconclusive peace would be a greater danger than the war itself", said John Hodge, a Labor member of the newly formed Lloyd George ministry. Coming so soon after the German overtures, it was taken as a reënforcement of the enemy's move. German hypnotism was at work and a German peace in the air, exclaimed the militant organ of the British Workers' League. Most irritating to the Labor majority was the statement that the professed aims of the Allies and Central Powers were virtually the same. The *New Statesman,* too, thought it unfortunate that the proposal for a league to enforce peace, of which it was an early protagonist, should be presented to the world in a document regarded with signal disfavor. Generally the President had a bad press.[14]

More favorable reactions occurred in some quarters. Dr. G. B. Clark, a supporter of the war who contributed regularly to the I. L. P. *Forward,* welcomed the note as affording the Entente a splendid opportunity to state their case to the neutral world. The *New Age,* hitherto critical of Wilson, advanced the startling interpretation that the note was a device to afford the Allies an opportunity to put their case before the American people under the most favorable circumstances on the theory that Wilson was already convinced that in self-defense America would sooner or later be driven into war against the Central Powers. The explanation of this unique point of view is to be found in a series of articles previously contributed by Professor George D. Herron to interpret the President to its readers. More consistent with former opinion was the joyful greeting of the Socialist left, who once more believed their own position confirmed and strengthened. It was "the policy we have been urging for the past eighteen months", said Ramsay MacDonald. The whole world was placed under deep obligation for "a great historic act of Christian statesmanship", said the *Bradford Pioneer.* E. D. Morel hailed the note as

[13] *Labour Leader,* May 25–June 22, Nov. 16, 1916; *Socialist Review,* Aug.–Sept., 1916, pp. 224–225, Jan.–Mar., 1917, p. 12; *New Statesman,* Nov. 11, 1916.

[14] *New Statesman,* Dec. 30, 1916; *British Citizen and Empire Worker,* Dec. 30–Jan. 27, 1916; *Seaman,* Jan. 5, 1917; *Clarion,* Jan. 27, 1917.

the act of a strong man who realized the immensity of the opportunity given him and who was willing to break with traditional formulae in order to espouse the cause of the peoples. The national administrative council of the I. L. P. sent an address of gratitude assuring the President that his action was gratefully appreciated by "the sober and responsible sections of the British people"—a bit of presumption which brought some gibes from the trade union center of the Labor party. The Marxians of the British Socialist party rejoiced at the "shrewd blow" which pointed out that there was no visible difference between the war aims of the belligerents. To them the action of the President appeared to put peace in sight. When the Allies responded, Philip Snowden wrote in the *Labour Leader* that the obtaining of a definite statement of terms was a great success for the pacifists.[15]

President Wilson revealed his reaction to the belligerents' replies in his "peace without victory" speech to the Senate on January 22, 1917. In stating the conditions under which the United States would join the proposed league of nations, which included equality of rights for all nations, recognition that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, freedom of the seas, and limitation of armaments, he drew the outlines of a program of international idealism which called forth a widespread favorable response from the ranks of Labor, in which was now developing an increasing undercurrent of skepticism as to the purity of their own government's war aims. On the morning of January 23 the annual conference of the party met in Manchester. The delegates assembled with the morning papers in their hands containing the report of the speech to the Senate. Early in the course of the presidential address G. J. Wardle mentioned the name of President Wilson. For the moment he was allowed to proceed no further. The trade union majority and the Socialist minority, with women delegates conspicuously in the lead, interrupted with an ovation of cheers. It was the greatest demonstration of the conference. The warmth and enthusiasm of Labor contrasted strongly with the hostility with which organs of the older parties greeted "peace without victory". Labor saw Wilson the chief exponent of its own ideals.[16]

[15] *Forward*, Dec. 30, 1916, Jan. 27, 1917; *Bradford Pioneer*, Jan. 12, 1917; *Labour Leader*, Dec. 28, 1916, Jan. 18, 1917; *Call*, Dec. 28, 1916, Jan. 11, 1917; *Socialist Review*, Jan.–Mar., 1917, pp. 1–3; *Report of the Annual Conference of the Independent Labour Party* (1917), pp. 8–9; *British Citizen and Empire Worker*, Jan. 20, 1917; *Scottish Cooperator*, Dec. 29, 1916.

[16] *Report of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1917); *Labour Leader*, Jan. 25, 1917; *British Citizen and Empire Worker*, Jan. 27, 1917; *New Age*, Feb. 1, 1917; *Clarion*, Feb. 2, 1917; *Shop Assistant*, Feb. 3, 1917.

The Independent Labor party especially hastened to claim the American President as their own asset. In the columns of the *Labour Leader* Philip Snowden pointed out how closely he had approached their position. "The I. L. P. and pacifist bodies in Great Britain", said he, "are entitled to feel and to express special gratification with the fact that the head of the greatest neutral Power in the world has come to the support of the same ideas and proposals which they have long advocated." They, too, had long urged that a peace based on victory would breed future wars and that in a negotiated peace alone was a permanent settlement possible. Snowden thought the bold declaration of the President must hasten the termination of the war. Ramsay MacDonald eulogized the speech as the one utterance of the war which made him feel that twentieth century civilization was not destined to perish. The *Bradford Pioneer* hailed Wilson as "the one great statesman the world possesses". *Forward* and the B. S. P. *Call* acclaimed him the man of the hour. Members of the Union of Democratic Control, including MacDonald, Snowden, Morel, and C. P. Trevelyan, wrote to request the President to demand from the Allies a restatement of their peace terms that would harmonize with his speech. On the extreme Labor right were some unfavorable voices. The British Workers' League denounced Wilson as an intolerable meddler and an academic excursionist into the realm of Utopian politics. "If we are not fighting for Victory, what ARE we fighting for?" exclaimed its spokesman. Nor could the *Clarion* see how the problems of Europe could be solved or even Wilson's own league brought into existence without first a German defeat. The moderate *New Statesman* appreciated his loftiness of thought and again rejoiced in his support of a league of nations, but could neither accept a principle which would deprive naval powers of their one offensive weapon nor a peace without victory which could be, in its estimation, only a German victory. The *New Age* showed more friendliness than in earlier years: the speech was not merely the most remarkable pronouncement of the war but also, because of the implication of American participation in a league, the most significant utterance of the decade.[17]

Only a few days after the "peace without victory" speech came the

[17] *Labour Leader*, Jan. 25, 1917; *Bradford Pioneer*, Jan. 26–Feb. 2, 1917; *Call*, Feb. 1, 1917; *Forward*, Mar. 17, 1917; *British Citizen and Empire Worker*, Jan. 27, 1917; *Clarion*, Jan. 26, 1917; *New Statesman*, Jan. 27, 1917; *Socialist Review*, Jan.–Mar., 1917, pp. 1–3; Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, III. 139. The editor of the *New Age*, Feb. 1, 1917, repeated his conviction that Wilson was preparing to offer the Allies the armed support of the United States. An article by George D. Herron in the issue for January 11 maintained that unless Germany put her peace terms on the table, America might soon be numbered among her enemies.

German government's repudiation of its promise of May 4, 1916, by a statement that it would sink all ships met in the barred zones, and the American answer in the form of a severance of diplomatic relations. British Labor, like all the world, watched with keenest interest. When the expected declaration did not immediately follow, the *New Age* marveled at Wilson's continued patience, but attributed it to the intention of further consolidating public opinion. Others thought the moment a precious one to cultivate Anglo-American friendship. The chauvinist *British Citizen and Empire Worker* professed an aversion to American entry into the war, because it did not want to see at the peace conference any "less implacable force than any members of the existing Alliance are likely to show in the final negotiations with the German plenipotentiaries". At the other extreme Philip Snowden regretted the painful sequel to the pacific efforts so fresh in mind and the *Bradford Pioneer* lamented that the one peace statesman in the world's governments was apparently taking sides in the struggle. The Marxian *Call* drew a lesson in the materialist conception of history with the picture of a genuine pacifist and sincere idealist dragged out of splendid isolation into a world war by force of economic ties with the Allies.[18]

The news of Wilson's address to Congress on April 2 and of the entry of the United States into the war four days later was greeted with enthusiasm in Great Britain. To the majority in the Labor movement it seemed that America was coming in with unimpeachable motives and the highest ideals. American intervention, together with the recent Russian Revolution, emphasized the lines of cleavage as between peace loving democracy and aggressive despotism. It strengthened the conviction in the justice of the Allied cause, while the assurance of Wilsonian idealism at the peace conference foreshadowed a righteous settlement. Unlike the *Times* and other representatives of the older press, which disapproved of Wilson's distinction between the German government and the German people, the Labor journals generally recognized it as a corollary of the war for democracy. So the articles deprecating American slothfulness, commercialism, and pro-Germanism gave way to others welcoming the prospect of closer understanding between the great English speaking peoples and recognizing the value of American aid. The veteran Socialist, H. M. Hyndman, published an open letter to Wood-

[18] *New Age*, Feb. 15, 1917; *Clarion*, Feb. 9, 1917; *New Statesman*, Feb. 10, 1917; *British Citizen and Empire Worker*, Feb. 10, Mar. 3, 1917; *Labour Leader*, Feb. 8, 1917; *Bradford Pioneer*, Feb. 9, 1917; *Call*, Feb. 15, 1917.

row Wilson saluting American intervention. The *British Citizen and Empire Worker,* which had so often attacked and caricatured Wilson as the tool of pacifists and pro-Germans, now grew lyrical in praising him for bringing the kindred nation into the great crusade. From the opposite wing of the party F. W. Jowett devoted much of his address as chairman of the annual meeting of the I. L. P. to an appreciation of Wilson. He pointed out that the President, unlike their own statesmen, had kept the nation informed of his policy, so that America entered the war unbound by secret commitments, such as existed between Great Britain and Russia, and without interest in alliances to maintain a balance of power. Wilson had set an example to the Allies by making a clear declaration of his objects. The speaker concluded that, if the Allied governments should follow the President's lead, a speedy peace would soon be possible.[19]

America's entry into the war, however, utterly disheartened most of the I. L. P. peace-by-negotiations group. Ramsay MacDonald, who had idealized Wilson and centered upon him his hopes for a decent settlement, could only regard him as an apostate. The prospect for a negotiated peace, which had a few weeks before loomed so large, had vanished. American participation would prolong the war, cause the death of millions, and deprive her of every possibility of enforcing a fair settlement, because "war psychology" would engulf the American people just as it had the other belligerents. J. Bruce Glasier, another veteran of the party, shared these opinions. However sincere Wilson might be, the "one great rock of refuge and peace" had been submerged. Philip Snowden's disappointment was bitter. He thought Wilson honest but inconsistent, for the answer to every line of his address to Congress was to be found in his own notes and speeches of the preceding months. Wilson had abandoned his high ground for the common position taken by every belligerent statesman. He predicted that, as the war fever rose and raged in the United States, the noble impulses still discernible in the President's words would disappear and the people would learn from practical experience what engaging in a war for liberty abroad meant to liberty at home. The *Bradford Pioneer* had dark forebodings for the future. Wilson took a country into war without any predatory desires, a fact which might restrain some of the more greedy Allies and result

[19] *New Statesman,* Apr. 7, 1917; *New Age,* Apr. 12–26, 1917; *Clarion,* Apr. 6–13, 1917; *Forward,* Apr. 21, 1917; *Seaman,* Apr. 13, 1917; *Scottish Cooperator,* Apr. 27, May 11, 1917; F. J. Gould, *Hyndman, Prophet of Socialism* (London, 1922), p. 222; *Report of the Annual Conference of the Independent Labour Party* (1917), pp. 39–42.

in a league of nations, but it was recalled that not many years before a jingo fury had swept that same nation into unforeseen paths of imperialism. The B. S. P. in its annual conference and in the columns of the *Call* developed another "profound lesson in the materialist conception of history". Before 1914 the United States was a borrower nation. Now the position was reversed and her world interests in jeopardy, whereupon Wall Street, the real ruler of the country, sensed that aloofness was no longer possible. It was such forces, using Wilson's known disinterestedness as a useful cloak, that carried the country into the war.[20]

During the following months President Wilson's preoccupation with the vigorous prosecution of the war deepened the gloom on the Labor left. When on June 9 the note to the new Russian government inviting the coöperation of the two peoples in the common object was made public, Philip Snowden bemoaned the wide departure from the "peace without victory" spirit. As a belligerent, he sighed, Wilson could only be a partisan. The Flag Day speech, claiming that the lust of world power of Germany's military masters had made it impossible for America to remain neutral, appeared to Snowden only a rehash of the stuff that had come out of the mouths of European statesmen in the first months of the war. The *Bradford Pioneer* lamented that Wilson had laid aside his high ideals in an attempt to enforce morality by the sword. The true leader now was revolutionary Russia, that blameworthy country of July, 1914, which had executed a glorious repentance and enunciated the program of no annexations and no indemnities. There were further attacks on the growing dictatorial powers of the President and the restrictions on free speech in the United States.[21]

The Labor majority, however, uniformly commended the President's course. Those of the war party who had sneered at his earlier notes and denounced or ridiculed American neutrality were now most laudatory. They praised his energetic preparations to make the Central Powers feel the might of America. They looked to him for moral leadership. When new material on German diplomacy came to light, it was of him they thought as the one to make use of it. The Willy-Nicky correspondence, said the *New Statesman,* "brings some useful grist to President Wilson's mill". In *Forward* "Rob Roy" (Dr. J.

[20] *Socialist Review,* May–June, 1917; *Labour Leader,* Apr. 5–May 31, 1917; *Bradford Pioneer,* Apr. 13–27, 1917; John L. Balderston in the San Francisco *Chronicle,* World Topics Section, Oct. 6, 1929; *Call,* Apr. 12–June 21, 1917.

[21] *Labour Leader,* June 14–21, Sept. 6–Oct. 11, 1917; *Bradford Pioneer,* June 22–July 6, 1917; *Forward,* Aug. 25, 1917.

Stirling Robertson) compared his speeches to the lofty and penetrating utterances of Tolstoy and said: "He gets right down to the bed rock of the moral and political issues, and puts them in the plain and direct language that comes straight from the heart of 'every man'." [22]

When on August 27, 1917, Wilson's reply to the Pope's peace note was published, it won general applause in Great Britain. The *New Statesman* voiced the prevalent feeling when it said Wilson had stated their reply with such conviction and force that nothing essential remained to be added by the other Allied leaders. "It is a pleasure", said "Rob Roy" in *Forward,* "to turn from the divided counsels of Europe to the clear, decided, and farseeing utterances of President Wilson." The *New Age* thought that the secular authority had shown himself better qualified to speak for mankind than the head of a great church. All sections of the party except the extreme right expressed satisfaction at his rejection of economic reprisals after the war such as were contemplated by the Allies in the Paris Resolutions of 1916. The I. L. P. organs were especially jubilant on this score, although they had no enthusiasm for the implied demand that the form of the German government be changed before peace negotiations be undertaken. Only the B. S. P. now manifested a lack of confidence in the President. The *Call*'s charge of insincerity was based upon the refusal of the American government to issue passports to delegates to the proposed Socialist and Labor conference at Stockholm.[23]

The speech to Congress on December 4, 1917, evoked widespread comment. The militants approved the will to victory, the demand for the evacuation and restoration of occupied territories, and the endorsement of the aspirations of subject nationalities in Austria-Hungary and Turkey. In contrast to President Wilson's "weighty words" the recent peace letter of Lord Lansdowne seemed composed of "empty phrases". At the same time they welcomed his repeated disapproval of an economic boycott after the war or any other manifestation of sheer revenge. By continuing to emphasize the distinction between the German rulers and the German people, it seemed that Wilson was holding out hope to the latter and, accordingly, showing himself more farsighted than European statesman. More and more a difference in methods and aims be-

[22] *Forward,* Aug. 11, 1917; *British Citizen and Empire Worker,* Sept. 1, 1917; *New Statesman,* Sept. 8, 1917.

[23] *New Statesman,* Sept. 1, 1917; *Forward,* Sept. 8, 1917; *Shop Assistant,* Sept. 8, 1917; *British Citizen and Empire Worker,* Sept. 1, 1917; *Clarion,* Sept. 7, 1917; *New Age,* Sept. 6, 1917; *Bradford Pioneer,* Sept. 7, 1917; *Labour Leader,* Sept. 6, 1917; *Call,* Sept. 6, 1917.

tween the Allies and the United States was apparent and, if the ideals of the war were to be attained, it would be by accepting the American lead.[24]

The Socialist groups were in despair at the will to military victory, together with "his assumption of the disinterested and exalted motives of the one side and the unrelieved depravity of the other".[25] In view of the revelations of the secret treaties recently made public by the Russians, it seemed unaccountable that the President should manifest such convictions. Yet toward his ideals for a settlement, there was a more favorable attitude in these quarters than at any date since the "peace without victory" speech. The *Labour Leader* said editorially: "His statement of International ideals after the war is so clear, his dealing with the freedom of the seas so unfaltering, his appeal to the German people once freed from their militarist rulers to enter into a permanent peace in a free world so unmistakeably sincere that together they form a series of promises bound to come home to roost sooner or later."[26]

The turn of the year witnessed the promulgation of a series of important peace programs. On December 28, 1917, the Labor party led off with its Memorandum on War Aims followed on January 5, 1918, by a pronouncement from Lloyd George. On January 8 President Wilson delivered the notable speech on the Fourteen Points, which drew an enthusiastic response from the entire Labor movement.[27] The first joint meeting of the Labor party executive, the Parliamentary party, and the new Political Committee of the Coöperators, symbolizing the spirit of unity, which during the past year had developed in the Labor movement, had been set for the next day. The opportunity was seized to issue a manifesto welcoming the policies enunciated by the American President. On January 23 the annual conference of the Labor party met at Nottingham. President Purdy's address stated that, if both sides would accept the principles laid down by the President, the way was clear for a world settlement that would contain no germs of future wars. The conference then passed a resolution, moved on behalf of the party executive by Arthur Henderson, to welcome "the statements as to War

[24] *Forward*, Dec. 22, 1917; *New Age*, Dec. 13, 1917.

[25] Snowden in the *Labour Leader*, Dec. 13, 1917.

[26] *Labour Leader*, Dec. 6, 1917; *Bradford Pioneer*, Dec. 7, 1917.

[27] The Fourteen Points were issued at this moment largely to maintain the enthusiasm of liberal and labor circles in Great Britain and France. Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, III. 317; Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York, 1922), pp. 208 ff.

Aims made by the British prime minister and President Wilson, in so far as they are in harmony with the War Aims of the British Labour Movement and make for an honorable and Democratic Peace".[28] The conference was glad to mention their own program in the same breath with that of the President, for the two were felt to be substantially the same. The qualifying clause had reference more to the utterance of Lloyd George over which there was less enthusiasm.

In the Labor world Wilson was lauded as the spokesman of Labor ideals. Almost every section saw in the Fourteen Points the supreme expression of its own program. Those who believed with Asquith and Viscount Grey interpreted them as an amplification of their official statements. The protagonists of a league of nations perceived there the outlines of tremendous changes that through world organization would in the next few years transform society. On the question of supporting Russia it was generally held that President Wilson stood in most favorable contrast to Lloyd George, for he paid a tribute to Russian idealism and insisted that Russia should not be deserted. Equally significant was the contrast in the treatment of economic questions. Whereas Wilson clearly intended to undo the Paris resolutions, the prime minister kept silence. On the question of subject nationalities the former's "points" coincided closely with Labor's own statement of war aims. Finally, the majority applauded his methods. He neglected neither the weapon of the sword nor the power of the pen. Without abating the thoroughness of his military effort, President Wilson simultaneously continued and even intensified his diplomatic campaign. It was the policy Labor had long pressed on their own government. They were pleased with its success. An editor of *Forward* wrote: "In this conflict a speech by President Wilson counts for as much as a victory in the field."[29]

Here and there was heard adverse comment on some details. From the right came a question as to the wisdom of abandoning the traditional British policy on the freedom of the seas. The president of the seamen, Havelock Wilson, voiced the opposition of his union to any concessions on this point.[30] From the other extreme came some doubts or dissents. Ramsay MacDonald feared that at the end of the war the

[28] *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (Jan., 1918), pp. 23, 94, 105.

[29] *Forward*, Jan. 19, Feb. 9, 1918; *New Statesman*, Jan. 12, 1918; *New Age*, Jan. 17, Feb. 21, 1918; *Scottish Cooperator*, Jan. 18, 1918.

[30] *British Citizen and Empire Worker*, Jan. 12–19, 1918; *New Statesman*, Jan. 12, 1918.

President would find himself powerless in face of imperialism and old diplomacy and predicted some of the defects of the Treaty of Versailles. The I. L. P. group regretted the failure to include in the territorial scheme Egypt, Tripoli, and other Allied possessions recently acquired by force. Yet this wing was among the President's stanchest supporters on the points of reduction of armaments, freedom of the seas, abolition of secret diplomacy, denial of economic war, restoration of the devastated areas, and a league of nations. Never since the "peace without victory" speech, in fact, had the Socialists thought so highly of the President. They endorsed his speech as, in the main, in line with the ideas of their International.[31]

The prestige of the President was heightened by his reply of February 11 to Count Hertling and Count Czernin in which he laid down four principles that must underlie territorial settlements. With his insistence that provinces must not be the subject of barter and that any territorial readjustments must be for the benefit of the people concerned, he came far closer to the heart of Labor than did European statesmen. His words made a stronger appeal than the restatement of British aims by Asquith and presented a striking contrast to the stiff tone of the Supreme War Council at Versailles. Labor welcomed the moderation that encouraged discussion. In fact there was even less adverse criticism than of the Fourteen Points, partly because they were not of the detailed nature of the latter. When, on February 23, the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist conference met in London, the four principles were included verbatim in their peace program.[32]

In the spring of 1918 while the German drives were making great wedges in the Allied front, peace talk subsided before the necessity of repelling the military danger. In a series of speeches between April 6 and July 4 President Wilson stated that the Allies would be diverted by no insincere approaches on peace and that there must be "force without stint" and "force to the uttermost". Complete victory and the destruction of arbitrary power were necessary preliminaries to a settlement, he said in advancing the four propositions of his Independence Day speech.

The will to victory at the moment harmonized with the mood of the war party. "President Wilson tried sweet reasonableness and found

[31] *Labour Leader,* Jan. 10–17, 1918; *Call,* Jan. 17, 1918.

[32] *Labour Leader,* Feb. 14, 1918; *Bradford Pioneer,* Feb. 15, 1918; *New Statesman,* Feb. 16, 1918; *British Citizen and Empire Worker,* Feb. 16, 1918; Charles A. McCurdy, *A Clean Peace: the War Aims of British Labour,* (London, 1918).

it a dud", wrote Robert Blatchford in the *Clarion*.[33] At the same time the emphasis on force sent some of the other wing again into doubts and perplexities about the American leader, who had again apparently forgotten "peace without victory" and was speaking the "knock-out blow" language of Lloyd George and Winston Churchill. He preached open diplomacy, yet was utterly silent upon the secret treaties. Surely he was cognizant of them with their revelation of Allied annexationist aims, for although officially secret, they had been published and translated into most European languages. He sent a sympathetic message to Russia (March, 1918), yet did not prevent the seizure of Vladivostok by Japanese and other Allied forces. The infamous Paris Economic Resolutions still stood. In spite of the speeches about liberty, there appeared to be a lack of it in his own land, as the arrest of Eugene V. Debs testified. Instead of converting the Allied governments to his idealism, Wilson seemed to be borrowing their methods.[34] The great organized expressions of the Labor movement, however, continued to center their attention on furthering the President's peace program. Resolutions by the parliamentary committee of the Trade Union Congress and the executive committee of the Labor party praised his terms as the basis of a peace of reconciliation and congratulated Lloyd George for accepting them. The Inter-Allied Socialist and Labor Conference, which met at London, September 17-20, 1918, welcomed the Fourteen Points as a confirmation of their own program of the preceding February and called upon organized workers everywhere to exert pressure upon their respective governments to adopt them. It bears significant testimony to Labor altruism that, at a moment when the Allied counter offensive was putting a decidedly favorable aspect on the battlefront, this assembly, the most representative yet held, consistently demanded a peace based not upon the war map but upon Wilsonian idealism.[35]

The last of the President's great speeches dealing generally with the issues of the war was delivered on September 27 at New York. After dwelling on the proposed league of nations, he laid down five principles of peace which again brought an enthusiastic response from British Labor. Said the *New Statesman*, "President Wilson's latest speech, admirable in its clarity, its high-mindedness, and its farsightedness,

[33] *Clarion*, May 24, 1918; "Rob Roy" in *Forward*, July 20, 1918.

[34] *Bradford Pioneer*, Apr. 19, May 31, July 19, Aug. 9, 1918; *Labour Leader*, Apr. 11, July 11, 1918; *Forward*, July 13, Aug. 17, 1918; *Socialist Review*, Oct.–Dec., 1918, p. 313; *Call*, Mar. 21, July 11, 1918.

[35] *Fiftieth Annual Report of the Trade Union Congress* (1918), p. 131; *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1919), pp. 3–10.

supplies just that sort of *credo* of our aims and policy which we need". From the I. L. P. wing came a chorus of approval. When Wilson said there must be no discrimination between those to whom the victors wished to be just and those to whom they did not wish to be just, that no special or separate interest of any group of nations could be served or economic combinations tolerated, and that all international agreements and treaties must be made known to the rest of the world, they could truthfully claim he was expressing ideas and advocating policies that had been their own since the war began. Evidently their voices had not been unheard and unheeded for he said, "Assemblies and associations of many kinds, made up of plain work-a-day people, have demanded almost every time that they have come together, and are still demanding that the leaders of their governments declare to them plainly what it is exactly that they were seeking in this war". So they were pleased when he called upon his associates to make it clear to the people of the Central Powers that they could have peace on terms that were just and fair to all parties concerned. They appreciated the use of the word "associated", which to their minds freed him from any taint of territorial and economic greed clinging to "Allies". Since President Wilson had uttered a formula that internationalists could accept, they were glad to see the leadership passing from the hands of their own statesmen into his.[36]

As the summer passed, the military outcome became more and more certain. Austria weakened first and in September made overtures to President Wilson. Since the note was not a full acceptance of the Wilsonian program, the Labor press commented favorably upon the President's refusal to consider it a satisfactory basis for negotiations. On October 4 the new German government of Prince Max followed with an appeal for peace. As the *Clarion* pointed out, it was an eloquent admission of a mighty change in world politics that it was addressed to no neutral king or belligerent monarch, but to the President of the world's greatest republic. In the exchange of notes that followed, Wilson's handling of the situation was approved as "adroit", "superb", and "beyond praise". So, too, was his refusal to deal with "Prussianism" and his insistence upon the democratization of Germany. While the negotiations were in progress the parliamentary committee of the Trade Union Congress, which could now speak for five million organized workers, together with the national executive of the Labor party issued

[36] *New Statesman*, Oct. 5, 1918; *Labour Leader*, Oct. 3, 1918; *Bradford Pioneer*, Oct. 11, 25, 1918; *Shop Assistant*, Oct. 26, 1918; *New Age*, Oct. 3, 1918.

a joint statement endorsing the line taken by the American President. They pointedly called upon the Allied governments to declare publicly and collectively an unqualified acceptance of his conditions as the basis of negotiations for a general peace, a step the latter had as yet failed to take.[37]

The Socialist left, too, watched closely Wilson's conduct of the negotiations. At the rejection of the first Austrian offer there was a moment of sickening disappointment. They feared he might prove ineffective at the very moment the longed-for peace was possible. The correspondence with Germany, however, quickly dispelled these doubts, so that even the brilliant but caustic Snowden characterized it as dignified and encouraging. To Wilson's diplomacy they attributed in large part the German military collapse and the democratic revolution which followed. Once more they interpreted the achievement as confirming the wisdom of their own program, namely, the simultaneous employment of diplomatic and military weapons. In the words of Ramsay MacDonald, Europe through the mouth of Woodrow Wilson was now listening to them. The prospect of peace rallied them to the ardent support of the only statesman who promised the realization of their ideals. Active assistance appeared all the more necessary as dangers beset the Wilsonian program from Allied quarters, where a belligerent press was excitedly opposing any armistice and peace in the spirit of the Fourteen Points. This jingoism was expressed in Labor and Socialist ranks only by H. M. Hyndman and the chauvinists of the British Workers' League, a small group by this time wholly out of sympathy with the Labor party and rapidly getting outside it. Another danger in America itself was seen in the attitude of Theodore Roosevelt and Senator Lodge toward the President. Imminent danger to the Fourteen Points and a league of nations, accordingly, brought the Labor left solidly into line with the majority in support of Wilson's leadership.[38]

Victory was followed by a slump in idealism. Voices that had been stilled before the tide of opinion were now raised in behalf of one

[37] *Clarion*, Sept. 20–Oct. 18, 1918; *New Statesman*, Oct. 19–26, 1918; *New Age*, Sept. 26, Oct. 31, 1918; *Forward*, Oct. 26–Nov. 2, 1918; *Labour Leader*, Oct. 17, 1918. On September 3, 1918, Colonel House called to Wilson's attention the danger of loss of influence in Labor circles in France and England, if success became assured without the Allies formally committing themselves to the American program. Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, IV. 64–65.

[38] *Labour Leader*, Sept. 26–Oct. 31, 1918; *Bradford Pioneer*, Oct. 25–Nov. 15, 1918; *Forward*, Oct. 5–Nov. 2, 1918; *Shop Assistant*, Nov. 9–23, 1918; *Socialist Review*, Jan.–Mar., 1919, p. 2; *British Citizen and Empire Worker*, Oct. 19, 1918; *Clarion*, Oct. 25, 1918.

special interest or another. There were disquieting reports of schemes of territorial aggrandizement and of hostility to the proposed league of nations. In the United States the Congressional elections went against the President's party in spite of his appeal for support. In England Lloyd George won an election with a slogan wholly at variance with the Wilson spirit. These developments were followed with anxiety by Labor. Philip Snowden wrote, "There is nothing to hope from the statesmen of Great Britain, France and Italy. President Wilson may save the situation, if he can only be assured that there is sufficient democratic backing in the Allied countries to enable him to defy the influential forces which are working for a vindictive and selfish peace." So he and other Labor spokesmen called upon all who wished a peace of reconciliation to make their voices heard above the clamor of the jingoes and allow President Wilson to enter the peace conference with knowledge of the support of the peoples of the Allied countries.[39]

Shortly after the armistice the rumor that President Wilson would visit Europe in person brought assurances of a hearty welcome, although a few doubts were expressed as to whether such a visit would strengthen or weaken his position. His actual appearance in France was the signal for a magnificent greeting from all the liberal and labor forces of Europe in which the British section joined whole-heartedly. His physical presence, it seemed, brought home as never before the strength that American idealism might exert at the peace conference. It was an assurance that, along with statesmen doubted or positively distrusted by Labor, there would be present one who would not permit that conference to be turned into a scramble for power and plunder. There might be feeble dissenting voices on either extreme, such as an openly expressed hope that a visit to the devastated areas might alter the Utopian ideas of the President, or an ill-timed sneer from the B. S. P. remnant that he had entered the war solely to save American investments, but the masses heartily approved a telegram of welcome sent by the Trade Union Congress and the Labor party. This greeting, signed by the secretaries of the two organizations, C. W. Bowerman and Arthur Henderson, respectively, voiced their admiration for Wilson's democratic statesmanship and endorsed specifically his program of a league of free nations, drastic reduction of armaments, and open diplomacy. When a few weeks later he paid a short visit to England

[39] Snowden in the *Labour Leader*, Dec. 19, 1918; *New Statesman*, Dec. 7–14, 1918; *Forward*, Oct. 26–Dec. 28, 1918; *Bradford Pioneer*, Nov. 22–Dec. 27, 1918; *New Age*, Oct. 31–Dec. 19, 1918; *Shop Assistant*, Dec. 28, 1918.

he was received both in the capital and in the provinces with an unparalleled spontaneity of enthusiasm in which Labor and Socialist elements were conspicuous. In London an address was presented to him on behalf of the Labor party and Trade Union Congress which reflected the whole-hearted admiration felt by the entire working class. When President Wilson left for Paris, accordingly, it was with the hopes of the British Labor movement centered on his ability to translate into the provisions of a treaty the high ideals they possessed in common.[40]

CARL F. BRAND.

Stanford University.

[40] *Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party* (1919), pp. 21–22; *New Statesman*, Aug. 17, 1918–Jan. 4, 1919; *New Age*, Nov. 28, 1918–Jan. 2, 1919; *Forward*, Dec. 21–28, 1918; *Bradford Pioneer*, Dec. 20, 1918; *Labour Leader*, Dec. 26, 1918; *Shop Assistant*, Jan. 4, 1919; *Clarion*, Dec. 20, 1918; *British Citizen and Empire Worker*, Dec. 28, 1918–Jan. 4, 1919; *Federationist*, Dec., 1918.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

World War Analogues of the *Trent* Affair

It is widely believed that the War of 1812 established for the United States, and that the *Trent* affair confirmed for the world, the principle that the crew and passengers of a neutral vessel shall not be subject to seizure on the high seas by belligerent force. Somewhat disillusioning, therefore, is the information that between November, 1914, and March, 1917, fifty-six men were forcibly removed from twelve ships flying the American flag and sailing on the high seas between neutral ports. Most of those arrested were subjects of the Central Powers, but at least one of them had filed a declaration of his intention to become an American citizen, and another had actually become naturalized. The French offended most frequently, six times, but the British, although participating in only five of the seizures, were responsible for forty-four of the persons concerned. The Germans, lacking control of the sea, were involved not more than once. In two instances passengers alone were removed, but as a rule regularly employed members of crews were seized, a practice which appears to have left several vessels dangerously short-handed.

The first case of this kind occurred in November, 1914, when the French removed from an American ship in Caribbean waters a German, August Piepenbrink, who four years earlier had filed a declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States. He was held by the British authorities at Jamaica, and strong representations were subsequently made both to Great Britain and to France. Although the question of the prisoner's citizenship was argued, it is more important to note that Secretary Bryan took the position, which was consistently maintained throughout the neutrality period, that no person was subject to seizure from a neutral vessel on the high seas unless actually incorporated in the armed forces of the enemy and bound for a belligerent port. The incident was closed when the British and the French governments in common agreed to release Piepenbrink "as a friendly act, while reserving the question of principle involved . . . ".[1]

[1] To avoid unnecessary documentation, it will suffice to note that the diplomatic correspondence referring to the cases here discussed appears in *Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1915 *Supplement*, pp. 744–755; 1916 *Supplement*, pp. 630–679; 1917 *Supplement*, pp. 526–532.

During December, 1915, a French cruiser, the *Descartes,* stopped four American ships near Porto Rico and boarding parties removed eight Germans and Austrians. This apparent beginning of a policy of wholesale seizure created a stir in the United States, and the owners of the vessels brought pressure to bear on the Department of State to safeguard their interests. With great vigor, therefore, Secretary Lansing reiterated the principles enunciated in the Piepenbrink case, emphasized the "very bad impression" created in the United States by these incidents, and insisted on the release of the prisoners.[2] The French government attempted to justify its action on the ground that the men, although not incorporated in the armed forces of the enemy, were plotters—an allegation which in no wise affected the position of the United States—and finally agreed to release the prisoners. But the Department of State, pressed by the shipowners, refused to be satisfied without an announcement of future policy. The French foreign office stated that it would have to consult England, and, hoping to remove any possible cause of friction, reported that the captain of the *Descartes* had been given orders to act with the greatest circumspection and not to stop any more American vessels.

The last French seizure, some six months later, took place in July, 1916, off the coast of Greece, when the second mate, of German birth but a naturalized citizen of the United States, was removed from an American ship, the *Frederick Luckenbach.* The French refused to recognize the officer's American citizenship on the ground that he had become naturalized after the outbreak of the war, but the Department of State, referring to the Piepenbrink case, was able to secure his release with a minimum of difficulty but without any definite commitment as to French policy.

In April, 1915, a German torpedo boat off the Swedish coast stopped an American vessel, the *Muskogee,* and a boarding party removed two seamen, both alleged Scandinavians. It developed, however, that the men were disguised German reservists, who apparently welcomed the opportunity to return home. The Department of State was thereupon content to drop the case by expressing its unwillingness to "acquiesce in a practice which might be regarded as lending assistance to deserting seamen . . . ".

[2] In general, public opinion in the United States, as revealed by the newspapers, was quite indifferent to the practice of seizure. The activities of the *Descartes* aroused the most interest, but the *China* incident, the most serious of all, passed almost unnoticed, as was true of the other ten cases.

The United States encountered in England, the traditional defender of the advantages enjoyed by preponderant naval strength, a power prepared to uphold its practices with ability and vigor. It is surprising that a clash was postponed until the period between January, 1916, and March, 1917, when there occurred five different instances of seizure by British ships, three of them involving the members of crews and not departing in any essential point from the Piepenbrink case.[3] The *Ausable,* however, was boarded while on its course and taken to an English port for the purpose of arresting a German subject; consequently, the Department of State regarded this seizure as having taken place at sea. The case of the *China,* the most important of all, requires more detailed treatment.

In February, 1916, a British cruiser off the Chinese coast stopped an American steamer, the *China,* and an armed force removed twenty-eight Germans, eight Austrians, and two Turks. Lansing became greatly concerned, demanded the release of the prisoners, and in the strongest terms insisted on an "apology for the disrespect shown the flag . . . ". Even Ambassador Page acted with such energy in handling the affair that on two occasions he received expressions of approbation from his superior. Sir Edward Grey attempted to justify the action of the British captain on the ground that the prisoners were plotters, but reference to the designs of the Confederate agents on the *Trent* broke down this contention, and the foreign office agreed to release the thirty-eight men. A short time later Grey learned that some of the Germans were reservists seeking to return to their country, and he desired to be released from his promise with respect to fifteen of the prisoners. Lansing, however, was obdurate and insisted that only men actually incorporated in the armed forces of the enemy were subject to removal on the high seas without prize court action. The British foreign office was disposed to agree with this principle, but claimed that German reservists, under modern conditions of warfare, fell into the category of armed forces, an interpretation unacceptable to the United States.[4] In the end, Grey was persuaded to release, with regrets, the thirty-eight men. Lansing, however, was eager to press for a settlement of the principles under dispute, and he was preparing to suggest arbitration when the United States declared war. Under these changed conditions the two powers, now allies, agreed

[3] The three American ships were the *Henry S.,* the *Marcus L. Urann,* and the *Allaguash.*

[4] The British, however, did not agree that the destination of those incorporated in the armed forces of the enemy must necessarily be a belligerent port before seizure could take place without prize court action.

to exercise reciprocally the practice to which the United States had objected as a neutral. All of the *China* prisoners, after prolonged negotiations, were released in Shanghai some nine months after their capture; but several other German subjects under discussion were still held by Great Britain when the United States entered the war.[5]

To summarize and conclude: It appears that the more pressing, but in principle no more important, neutral difficulties of the United States between 1914 and 1917 have obscured the fact that a number of persons were forcibly removed from American vessels on the high seas and that the principles of the *Trent* case have by no means received universal acceptance. Nor does this study include the one instance of the French boarding an American vessel and forcing three Germans to sign paroles not to serve in the armed forces of their country during the war, seizures from American ships while in port or on canals, of which there were several, or the numerous cases of search with intent to remove enemy aliens. Nor was the act of seizure in itself the only disagreeable feature of the incidents under review, for reports of the firing of projectile shots, the breaking open of boxes, the damaging of the ship's lining, the removal of the most needed officers, the separation of families, the financial loss resulting from delay and inconvenience, and discourteous and arbitrary treatment by boarding parties—all these features are unpleasantly reminiscent of pre-1812 days. The arrests were not only irritating but relatively valueless, for most of the men removed were regularly employed, except those on the *China,* and apparently had no intention of joining the belligerent armies or navies. In the case of the *China,* the British claimed only fifteen of the prisoners as incorporated in the armed forces of the enemy; but even if these men had been retained, the resulting advantages would have been more than offset by the danger of antagonizing public opinion in the United States. Nevertheless, in this one case at least, it would seem as if England acted with more show of reason than was evidenced in the other seizures, and her point that the whole subject should later be considered in the light of modern warfare appears

[5] Both Ambassador Page and the editor of his letters give the erroneous impression that the *China* affair was of little consequence and that the British settled it with dispatch. Burton J. Hendrick, *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page,* II. 155. The published documents show that more than thirty communications, several of them lengthy, were exchanged on this subject alone, and that the tone adopted by the United States was extremely vigorous. On May 5, 1916, Grey promised to release the men, but the ensuing delay was so annoying that the Department of State sent at least four telegrams to Page, specifically inquiring if the prisoners had been freed and, if not, why not. It is to be noted that not until six months later, partly owing to transportation difficulties, were the men returned to China.

to have been well taken. In general, both France and Great Britain were deferential to the demands of the United States, a nation whose friendship was eminently desirable, but they were much more willing to surrender individuals than principles. It is significant, however, that the United States, the only neutral with sufficient power to command a hearing, took vigorous steps to check a practice which threatened at one time to become general and which otherwise would doubtless have been exercised on a much larger scale.

THOMAS A. BAILEY.

Stanford University.

DOCUMENTS

Another Dispatch from the United States Consulate in New Orleans

THIS *Review* a few years ago (vols. XXXII., pp. 801–824; XXXIII., pp. 331–359) printed a group of documents under the title Despatches from the United States Consulate in New Orleans, 1801–1803, which were selected from the bound manuscript volume in the State Department Archives labeled "Consular Letters, New Orleans". The following letter, which comes from the same source, was not published in that series apparently because, through a mistake of the binder of the volume, the first four of the eight manuscript pages of the letter, containing the date, were placed after a letter of 1806, that is, in a section having nothing to do with the transfer. The last four pages, which appear in the proper place, would seem to a reader to be a fragment of little value. In view of its contents, now that the parts are brought together, the letter should be added to the published series, for it gives valuable information regarding the activities of the writer, Daniel Clark, American consul at New Orleans, in support of the interests of the United States there, and it contains a brief but pungent description of the transfer of Louisiana from Spain to France.

Cornell University. ARTHUR P. WHITAKER.

New Orleans 3rd December 1803

Sir

I had the Honor of advising under date of the 29th ult$^{o.}$[1] that the Province was to be delivered up to the French Government on the 30th and that the preparations of the prefect [2] were in forwardness for the Occasion. I saw on the evening of that day with some anxiety the marked dislike of the militia and their officer, to do duty under him, and as he had refused the Service of the Spanish Soldiery as auxiliaries which had been handsomely offered him by the Spanish Commissioner, I determined on offering him assistance to preserve tranquility and good order in the City until the arrival of our Commissioners,[3] and the forces under them which a thousand voices were hourly calling for. The friendly disposition of the Spanish officers and their willingness [4] to Comply with their orders to deliver up the Country were manifested

[1] *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIII. 353–355.

[2] The French prefect, Pierre Clément de Laussat.

[3] Governor William Charles Cole Claiborne and General James Wilkinson, commissioners of the United States for taking possession of Louisiana.

[4] First written "unwillingness" and then corrected by the partial erasure of the prefix.

at this time in the most unequivocal manner. on the morning of the 30th notice having been given to the Americans and those connected with them of my wish to assemble them they met accordingly and a Volunteer association [5] was immediately formed Consisting of about 100 persons who agreed to do military duty under the American flag and officers of their own choice who were immediately nominated and authorised to make the Prefect the offer of their Service to maintain good order and which was gladly accepted. The appointment of Captain as it was a mark of the Confidence of my fellow Citizens being confirmed in me I accepted, and we have since then constantly done duty and the Grand Guard and the City Patroles have been furnished by the Company which now Consists of upwards of 180 of the most respectable people who all wear the American Cockade and in Case of necessity could be immediately doubled so that I flatter myself there is a power in my hands fully adequate to preserve peace and tranquility let who would endeavour to disturb it. The youth of the City and the respectable merchants are hourly joining the Company and adopt the Cockade so that I hope to have a Battallion of americans or of people heartily attached to the Cause of America organized before the arrival of the Commissioners to whom I forwarded an express at the moment possession was taken and the french Colors hoisted with a letter from the prefect and a few lines from myself to hasten their departure from fort Adams. The morning of the surrender of the Country was gloomy and an incessant torrent of rain poured down the whole day; notwithstanding, the Soldiers and militia were under arms and the principal part of the Inhabitants, male and female assembled in the great square; at 12 oClk the spanish Commissioners attended by the Cabildo having met at the Town house, the prefect and his suit were introduced, possession was delivered, the spanish flag hauled down and the french substituted in its room under a discharge of Cannon. Except the noise of the Cannon not a sound was heard, the most gloomy silence prevailed and nothing could induce the numerous spectators to express the least Joy or give any sign of satisfaction on the Occasion.[6] a general fear and hatred of the french Government prevail, and our own is looked to as the point of salvation for the Country. this enthusiasm is rapidly increasing and has seized even to the [*sic*] who already appear with black Cockades and in a week I flatter myself there will be found very few young or old,—without this outward sign of attachment to our Cause which I spare no pains to promote and distribute Cockades to all who apply for them—the very officers of the Spanish Government aid me by their

[5] The information here given in regard to the "association" is one of the most interesting features of the letter. The subject is discussed in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIII. 355–356. The Pittsburgh *Tree of Liberty* of Jan. 21, 1804, published an extract of a letter from a commercial house at New Orleans to another at New York, dated Dec. 6, 1803, in which it was stated among other things that this volunteer body was formed on the recommendation of the American consul (Clark) and consisted of one hundred and fifty Americans and fifty "inhabitants", who turned out in rotation every forty-eight hours to guard the public buildings and forts and preserve order until the arrival of the United States army.

[6] Intendant Morales's report of the transfer corroborates Clark on this point. So universal was the detestation of the new régime in Louisiana, he said, that the French authorities had to employ one of their own priests in order to obtain the substitution of the French republic for the king of Spain in the prayers (Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de Santo Domingo, *legajo* 2599, Morales to Soler, Dec. 5, 1803, no. 260).

endeavours, the proclamation of the Prefect has added great weight and it will be the fault of those appointed to govern us if the enthusiasm is not carried to the highest pitch and the people rendered perfectly Content and happy under the new change of Governmt. On the day of the surrender every thing passed in the most perfect harmony, the spanish Guards were withdrawn, the late Colo. of militia having resigned, was replaced by another, the Cabildo was suppressed [7]—a municipality installed in its place and a few other officers appointed to preserve the peace. The City funds have since been delivered up. the prefects fete on the following day was splendid, all ranks and nations, was numerously attended and universal satisfaction was given, the Conduct of the spanish authorities has been frank and Generous and there is every reason to hope that matters will remain quiet and the people in good temper till permanent regulations are made to ensure their future tranquility. I enclose you Copies of the proclamations, the arretes of the prefect and municipality that you may see and judge of the nature of their proceedings. The Spanish Sloop of War now here is preparing for sea and in a few days will return to the Havana with the remnant of the Battallion of Mexico now here and the other spanish Troops will be embarked as shortly after as possible. The Marquis de Casa Calvo is preparing a fete [8] to rival that of the Prefect and this interchange of Civilities, politeness and attention will be a further step to support good order—In imitation of our Conduct the prefect has now set to work to organise a Company of french [9] to guard his standard on the day of delivery to us, but he will not succeed in making it either as respectable or numerous as that of the American Volunteers among whom are enrolled many of those whom he at first Counted on, and if I would permit those enrolled in the City militia to join me I should leave him almost without a single soldier. To quiet those who are already enrolled and who apply to me I tell them that in a few days they will have an opportunity of shewing their attachment to the U. S. by their zeal in executing the orders of the Commissioners, that in the meantime their services is as acceptable and useful as militia men under the orders of the officers appointed by the prefect as if they served immediately under myself, that we have all the same object in view, to preserve good order and that a very short time will unite us under the same standard never to be afterwards disunited. This produces the desired effect and the day we take possession will be a day of Joy and exultation, it will not pass in Gloomy silence like that which ushered in the Authority of the prefect but the General Joy will manifest itself [10] by the most heartfelt and unbounded acclamations —and when the american flag is hoisted the sound of the Cannon announcing

[7] Laussat's highly unfavorable opinion of the *cabildo* can be found in Marc de Villiers du Terrage, *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française* (Paris, n. d.), p. 418. The *cabildo* was a kind of town council, but it was not in any sense a popular body, since its members were nominated by the governor and appointed by the king. Claiborne wrote Madison on Dec. 27, 1803, that he was "not a little indebted" to Laussat for suppressing it. Dunbar Rowland, ed., *Official Letter Books of W. C. C. Claiborne* (Jackson, 1917), I. 315.

[8] This is probably the fête which was given by Casa Calvo on Dec. 8 and is said to have cost him 15,000 francs. Villiers du Terrage, *op. cit.*, p. 427.

[9] *Cf. ibid.*, p. 420.

[10] At this point occurs the break between the two sections of the manuscript mentioned in the introductory note.

the Event will be drowned in the louder cries of our exulting people. I long for and anticipate the pleasure all will feel on the occasion, and can with truth assure you that not a dozen individuals in the City wish for the Continuance of the Prefects authority. Would it had never existed as he will doubtless take from hence Occasion to impress on the people the Certainty of a support from France to all who at any time may espouse her Cause and procure them satisfaction for wrongs done them in Consequence. this he has in agitation and tho' cloathed only with a little brief authority he intends reinstating the Commandant of Atacapas in his Post who was suspended for an excess of Zeal for his Cause and by an arreté has declared another innocent, who was accused and imprisoned for a murder said to be Committed by him in the same district.[11] This immediate reparation of wrong and over hasty zeal on his part to declare a supposed Criminal innocent without waiting for legal forms and interfering in a matter wholly foreign to his authority, viz. the Judiciary, Can only be meant to keep alive a spirit of party and increase it. He shewed me yesterday the arreté he meant to issue respecting the supposed assassin, and as it was Conceived in terms too harsh and severe must offend the spanish Authorities by declaring innocent a man whom they all looked on as guilty, and by accusing them of wilfully persecuting innocence merely for an attachment to france, might be productive of harm, I prevailed on him to alter and modify it. Still the nature of the thing must give well grounded reason to complain of his violence and party attachments. I take the liberty to recommend that Govenor Claiborne be instructed privately not to employ those who having received favors and pay from the spanish Government were at the same time zealously promoting the Cause of France and crying out against us—these men he will chiefly find employed in filling up the tempory offices created by the prefect, and tho' myself a decided Enemy to persecution and careless who may fill any office or hold any employment yet I think it would be incompatible with the public weal to continue the few mortal enemies we have in the Country in place who are mostly as ignorant and incapable as they are now fawning adulators of the prefect and would be dangerous if they had the power and opportunity to be so. these characters are well known and the Public voice will call for their removal. in this particular I shall intrude my opinion on the Governor unsolicited and hope he may perceive the necessity of paying some attention to it. notwithstanding my known attachment to the U. States, the decisive language I held when delays and difficulties were supposed to be contemplated, when the honor or Interests of the U. S. in any manner attacked and the more decisive measures it was as well known I should resort to if necessary, I have still the pleasure to inform you that I have been singularly fortunate in preserving the friendship and Confidence of all the spanish officers, also Consulted and trusted at the same time by the prefect and enjoy a high share of popularity and authority with the public, I shall endeavour to avail myself of these favorable Circumstances and strengthen then the growing attachment of the people to

[11] The commandant in question was Louis DeBlanc, and the accused man Louis St. Julien. The person whom he was charged with murdering was his wife. The merits of the case were soon obscured by the partisan controversy which it aroused. See James A. Robertson, *Louisiana under the Rule of Spain, France and the United States* (Cleveland, 1911), II. 45, 238–239, and *Official Letter Books of W. C. C. Claiborne*, index, under "St. Julien".

the U. States; to encrease the fervor of their enthusiasm and Convince them that under their government they can alone expect protection safety and happiness; my task is now nearly ended, and if my endeavours to be useful on all occasions, if that attachment to the U. S. which I may boldly flatter myself to have created nursed, matured and finally impressed on the people of the Country, if the Zeal I have shewn in the defence and protection of individuals and national Interests, the dangers I have exposed myself to, suffice it to procure me your approbation—I shall think myself amply rewarded by it, and remain very

Respectfully Sir,
your very ob^{t} Servant
Daniel Clark

P. S. 6th December—All remains quiet and harmony prevails among us—at the moment of closing this letter a Courier has arrived from Washington with Dispatches from the Spanish ambassador to the Governor and marquis.[12] he left it on the 2^{d} nov. the Contents of these dispatches have not yet transpired. I have just come from visiting the marquis who has given orders that the troops of the U. S. whether by land or water be permitted to pass the spanish forts at Baton Rouge. We are in anxious expectation of the arrival of our Commissioners but entertain no fear of any thing disagreeable occurring until they get here.

Honb$^{le.}$ James Madison

A Secret Military Document, 1825

THE report [1] submitted to the Duke of Wellington on the state of the defenses of Canada in 1825 is a valuable document in the study of the history of the relations between the United States and Canada, although the contents of the official copies are not so important as the omissions. In 1825 a commission consisting of Major General Sir James Carmichael Smyth, president, Lieutenant Colonel Sir George Hoste, and Captain John B. Harris was sent by the British war department to investigate the state of defenses of the British North American provinces. That this was considered an important undertaking is shown by the personnel of the commission, two of whom are subjects of biographies in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.[2]

[12] That is, dispatches from the Marqués de Casa Irujo, Spanish minister to the United States, to Governor Salcedo and the Marqués de Casa Calvo, Spain's commissioners for effecting the transfer of Louisiana to France.

[1] *Copy of a Report to His Grace The Duke of Wellington Master General of His Majesty's Ordnance &c &c &c Relative to His Majesty's North American Provinces by a commission of which M. General Sir James Carmichael Smyth was president, Lieut. Colonel Sir George Hoste, Captain Harris members.* (London?, 1825.)

[2] Sir James Carmichael Smyth, Baronet, 1779–1838, had served with the royal engineers at the Cape of Good Hope in 1795 and on the Continent. He was at the battles of Quatre Bras and Waterloo. After his Canadian mission he was sent to Ireland in 1828 on a similar one. In 1829 he was appointed governor of the Bahama islands and in 1833, of

The commissioners wrote their report in Halifax on September 9, 1825, and the war department ordered that twenty-five copies be lithographed. However, it was thought inadvisable to lithograph a lengthy paragraph of the report, the fifty-second, "on the vulnerable points of America". The manuscript bears the note, "N. B. His Grace [the Duke of Wellington, Master General of the Ordnance] desires that the 52nd. Paragraph is not to be lithographed — Four copies to be made". The four copies evidently referred to the fifty-second paragraph only. Lithographed copies of the report, which do not contain this paragraph, are preserved in the Boston Public Library, the Public Archives of Canada, and the War Office, while the Bodleian Library, the British Museum, the New York Public Library, the Burton Historical Collection, and the Library of Congress do not appear to possess copies. However, the copies in the Public Reference Library, Toronto, and in the Public Record Office, among the papers of Sir James Carmichael Smyth, have as inserts copies of the fifty-second paragraph. The original manuscript of the report, from which the fifty-second paragraph given below is copied, is preserved in the Public Record Office.[3]

The commissioners left Liverpool on April 17, 1825, and sailed on an American packet to New York, where they arrived on May 17. They shortly afterwards set out for Quebec and arrived on May 25. Sir Peregrine Maitland was in command of the forces in both Upper and Lower Canada during the absence of Lord Dalhousie.

After studying the situation the commissioners came to the conclusion that the frontier might be said to stretch for nearly nine hundred miles from "where the 45th Degree of North Latitude intersects the range of mountains between the District of Maine in the United States

British Guiana. *D. N. B.*, LIII. 185–187. *A list of the officers of the Army and Royal Marines* (London, 1825), pp. 18, 59, 333. Sir James Carmichael, ed., *Precis of the Wars in Canada, from 1755 to the Treaty of Ghent in 1814, with Military and Political Reflections, by the late Maj.-Gen. Sir James Carmichael Smyth* (London, 1862).

Sir George Charles Hoste, 1786–1845, royal engineers, lieut. col. 1825, colonel 1841. Present at the battles of Quatre Bras and Waterloo and accompanied Smyth to Ireland in 1828. *D. N. B.*, supp. vol. II., pp. 447–448. *Army List*, 1825, pp. 44, 334.

John Brenchley Harris, captain royal engineers, Jan. 10, 1812, on temporary half pay Apr. 1, 1817. *Army List*, 1825, p. 339.

[3] The writer is indebted to Dr. George Locke, chief librarian, and Miss Frances Staton, reference librarian, of the Toronto Public Library for drawing his attention to this document, and to Mr. C. T. Flower, secretary of the Public Record Office for supplying information regarding the manuscript and enabling him to have the fifty-second paragraph photostated. He is also indebted to the officials of all the above mentioned institutions for information regarding the report.

The Public Record Office reference to the report is W. O. 55–1551–7.

and Lower Canada as far as that end of the River St. Clair next to Lake Huron". They did not feel that the shores of Lake Huron, with the exception of some country about Penetanguishene harbor, could be considered a military frontier as that country was in a state of nature and covered with impenetrable forests. But they added that notwithstanding the length of frontier, local circumstances were such that American armies had only three lines of operation which they could follow with success against the Canadas. These lines of possible operation were described in great detail but it will be necessary only to note them here.

The first and most important route was that via Lake Champlain, which was, according to the commissioners, also the weakest and most vulnerable point in Canada. The second line of attack would be upon Kingston from Lake Ontario. The commissioners felt that there was little danger of attack in the 170 miles between Kingston and Montreal, but the completion of the proposed Rideau canal would make defense of the second section vital. The movement of American troops in the Lake Ontario area would, they felt, be made in the following ways: "The capture of Kingston, the destruction of the dockyard and naval establishment at that important point. The taking possession of York, which being the seat of government, and the depot for all papers and archives of the province would cause considerable confusion. And lastly a cooperation in the invasion of the Niagara frontier." The third center of operations would be on Lake Erie. This would involve the landing by the enemy on Turkey Point to attack the rear of the forces defending the Niagara peninsula. Amherstburg would also be a center of attack in the third line of operations although the commissioners felt that only a predatory attack needed to be feared in this sector as they said, "An invasion of the country with a view to permanent conquest would we respectfully submit, hardly be made at so remote a part".

The report describes nothing in Upper and Lower Canada except the military defenses and canals. No word is said regarding the social or political condition of the colonies. The commissioners were entirely impersonal and did not even tell how they traveled. The only remarks which might be construed as political are those describing York (later Toronto) which had been made the center of government of Upper Canada in 1797, regarding which the commissioners wrote, "We cannot avoid expressing upon the subject of York our regret, that it should ever have been selected for the capital of Upper Canada. It offers no advantages that we are aware of either of a civil, military or commercial nature. There never can be any water communication to it, . . . Kingston appears

to us to be the natural capital." The commissioners believed that the commercial importance of Kingston would be increased by the completion of the Rideau canal and by making Kingston the capital the civil, naval, and military authorities would be collected together.[4] From a military point of view, however, the report is all that could be expected and undoubtedly gives details of the defenses of Canada in 1825, not preserved in any other place.

The most interesting feature of the report is that the possibility of war between the United States and the British American provinces was considered, by the commissioners, to be very real and that they thought a plan of attack on the United States might well be drawn up. That the Duke of Wellington considered the proposals important enough to warrant their omission from the published report adds to their interest.

The lines of attack on the United States proposed by the commissioners were contained in the fifty-second paragraph which is here given in full.

Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario.

JAMES J. TALMAN.

52nd.

Vulnerable points of America.

In reflecting upon the general defence of His Majesty's North American Provinces, it occurred to us, we venture to observe to Your Grace, that on such an extensive Frontier as is presented by the United States, opposite to Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—the Enemy must have vulnerable points against which Offensive Operations might be undertaken with every prospect of success—and which, of course, would materially contribute to the defence and security of British North America. As we landed at New York —we had an opportunity of travelling to Canada by what must be, we humbly conceive, the principal line of Operations from the United States against Canada/ namely, by Lake Champlain and the Richelieu River. A British Army pushed forward by this Line/ and advanced from the head of Lake Champlain to Waterford, the point of junction of the Mohawk with the North River—, would effectually prevent all invasion of Canada—as it would be in command of the point from whence all the water communications emanate, and the different lines of operation commence. As such a movement would probably, however, be reckoned too enterprizing and hazardous, it struck us that the Communication between Waterford and Lake Erie, conducted not far from our frontier, and parallel to it for so many miles, must at any rate, be liable to interruption. With a view to ascertain this fact we deemed it advisable, and which measure we hope will meet with Your Grace's approbation, that Captain Harris[5] should travel along this Canal, on his

[4] *Report*, p. 45.

[5] As the commissioners, when they were at Detroit, discovered that it would take them six weeks to visit Drummond Island and return, they determined to send Captain Harris to study Amherstburg and Drummond Island while they returned to Halifax. Paragraph 25.

return from Drummond Island [6]—and join the Commission at Halifax, instead of returning to Quebec. From his report it appears that there are three points where there would be very little difficulty in sufficiently destroying the Works of the Canal so as to render it unavailable for the purposes of forwarding any Military Stores to Lake Erie or to Lake Ontario, for several Campaigns at least. Within 30 miles of Buffalo, the mouth of the Canal on Lake Erie; at a place called Lockport, there are 5 double Locks, close to each other, required to rise 60 feet in a space of 130 yards. These Locks are so close to the British Frontier, that there could not be much difficulty in sending over a sufficient detachment to destroy them. Thirty Miles from Lockport—in continuing along the course of the Canal, an embankment has been made across a deep chasm of 75 feet in height—by 100 yards in length, to retain the Canal. This embankment could, of course, very easily be cut through. Twenty Miles on further,—and situated 7 miles from the Mouth of the Gennessee River, (which empties itself into Lake Ontario) the Canal is conducted across that River upon an Aequeduct of 10 arches—at a Town called Rochester. The ground is represented as being very strong at Rochester—and such as could be advantageously held by a Corps, until the necessary Operations for blowing up one or two of the Arches—Could be arranged.

We have thought it our duty, with the utmost deference, to submit our Ideas and the result of our enquiries and observations to Your Grace: at the same time, we are convinced Your Grace will deem any operations undertaken merely with a view to injure the Canal, and to throw delays and difficulties, rather than altogether to impede, the Enemy's communications and means of assembling his Military Stores, but a petty mode of Warfare, and not suited to the character and dignity of His Majesty's Arms. Should, however, the advance to Waterford be reckoned too rash, and be disapproved of as risking too much without an adequate object, we are afraid, from the peculiar geographical situation of the United States, that no military Operation whatever, can be undertaken from His Majesty's North American Provinces (by land) or that any blow can be struck from thence which would be sensibly felt by the Government of the United States.

We take the liberty of observing to Your Grace that many of the States of the Union have a small direct taxation, and a Revenue arising from the Sale of Lands, and other sources. The General Government of America has, however, no mode of raising money but by the Custom House Duties upon its' Imports and Exports. If, therefore, this external commerce can be effectually and completely suspended, the Government from want of means to pay the expenses of a War, it appears to us, must be compelled to make Peace upon the Terms imposed by that Power which can control its' navigation.

We submit, with the utmost deference, that the means are in our power, completely to blockade New York, and a very considerable extent of the American Coast—by taking possession of Long Island and of Staten Island, and thus not only to deprive the American Government of all revenue arising from the commerce of so important a place; but to prevent any Ships

[6] Drummond Island, a British military post in the northern part of Lake Huron, is in Michigan, having been granted in June, 1822, to the United States by the commission appointed under article VI. of the Treaty of Ghent. However, the British troops did not leave until Nov. 16, 1828. Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, *Historical Collections* (Lansing, 1895), XXIII. 306, 543.

of War sailing from thence for the annoyance of the Trade of His Majesty's Subjects. The Americans have constructed Works on both these Islands, at a considerable expense—but they have fortified upon a wrong principle, looking entirely to the defence of the Harbour. In the event of our landing on the South Side of Long Island, and West Side of Staten Island: all their Works would be taken in reverse. Long Island is highly cultivated, and abounds with resources Twenty five Thousand British Troops disembarked on these Islands—could never be dislodged. We think such a measure, if conducted with secrecy and promptitude could not fail of success, and would be a more effectual blow than any operation which could be undertaken from Canada; where from local circumstances, it would appear, We submit with deference to Your Grace, We can only act upon the defensive.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS

Historical Scholarship in America: Needs and Opportunities. A Report by the Committee of the American Historical Association on the Planning of Research. (New York: Ray Long and Richard Smith. 1932. Pp. viii, 146. $1.50.)

THIS survey of *Historical Scholarship in America* comes opportunely as the American Historical Association approaches the close of its first half-century. It is a good time for taking account of stock, for open-minded reconsideration of the work that needs to be done, in the light of present day perspectives. What may reasonably be expected of American historians in the years to come? What, in particular, can the American Historical Association, as the chief corporate agency of the profession as a whole, contribute toward the realization of such legitimate expectations? These are large questions, certain to be approached from different points of view; on many aspects of the inquiry varying modes of approach will lead to equally different conclusions. The present report is doubtless intended to initiate general discussion, to serve, so to speak, as *agenda* for consideration in committee of the whole. The findings and recommendations of the planning committee are the result of extended discussion, both in the main committee and in subcommittees fairly representative of particular fields of study and different schools of thought. It is, therefore, much to be desired that the report should be widely read and its conclusions carefully weighed.

Recent discussion of the status and functions of the Association has been stimulated by certain developments of the last ten years. One factor has been the effort of the Association to secure additional financial support, whether through an increase in its permanent endowment, or through temporary grants for specific purposes. Though handicapped by adverse conditions, this effort has attained a moderate degree of success and enlarged the funds available for publication and research. It thus becomes more than ever the duty of the Association to consider how its resources can be used most effectively. A second factor has been the establishment within the last decade of organizations for the promotion of research in certain groups of subjects, notably the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies. With the setting up of both these institutions and the formulation of their programs, the Historical Association has been actively concerned. Like the other coöperating societies, the Association has naturally been forced to reconsider the differentiation of its own special func-

tions, and the best means of relating its own activities to those ot other groups of workers. So it came about quite naturally that the present inquiry was authorized by the Council of the Association with the financial support of the two research councils.

Recognizing at the outset the difficulty of formulating recommendations equally applicable to Ancient history on the one side and American history on the other, the committee has relied largely upon the work of five "Conferences of Specialists", one each for Ancient, Medieval, and Modern history, and two for American history. The separate statements formulated by each of these groups appear in part II. of the published report. In part I., the general committee summarizes those conclusions in which a substantial consensus of opinion was reached, with due recognition also of special situations in the various fields. A suggestive retrospect of "history in America", contributed by Dr. Jameson, supplies a suitable background for the discussion of present problems and future policies.

The specific proposals offered by the committee cover so wide a range as to preclude adequate discussion here of more than a few points. With respect to the materials of research, the committee proposes a considerable expansion of the type of service already undertaken or contemplated by research agencies—more systematic planning for the development of library collections, both printed and manuscript; large-scale surveys for the location and listing of manuscripts; the publication of documentary sources. Under this head also come useful suggestions for the extension and improvement of historical museums. Another group of proposals has to do with the problem of guiding research, especially that of younger scholars, so as to promote studies of hitherto neglected fields as against too close cropping of other areas. A third closely related problem taken up by the committee is that of supplying suitable means of publication for the results of such researches.

A fourth set of proposals is concerned with more effective organization and procedure in existing agencies for the promotion of historical research. As far as the American Historical Association is involved, the two major recommendations under this head are the establishment of a permanent secretariat and the making of regular provision for specialist conferences similar to those which have collaborated in the present inquiry. The first of these measures has already been accepted in principle by the Association, and though the financing of such an advance is obviously difficult at this time, an important first step has already been taken. Responding to a request from the Association, the Carnegie Corporation has recently voted an appropriation of $12,000 which, unlike the greater part of the new endowment, is available for overhead service. The present grant is made without commitments for the future; but judicious use of this new fund should enable the Association to demonstrate the value of a full time secretariat, not only or chiefly for the management of routine business, but primarily in the in-

terest of effective leadership both in the discussion of policies and in the devising of ways and means for carrying them into effect.

When all is said and done, no accumulation of material, or formulation of research programs, or improvement in administration will in itself insure a high quality of historical scholarship. That depends in the last resort on the type of men who can be attracted to the profession, and the guidance which the universities are able to give them. So the committee has properly emphasized the problem of recruiting capable men, providing them with more adequate training, and enabling them to work with greater freedom from routine demands. With most of what is said under this head the reviewer is in substantial accord with the committee. To one more or less familiar with the output of graduate schools in this country, it is a question whether almost the first step to be taken is not one of elimination. A major problem in any university is that of giving the student, outside the classroom as well as in it, a sufficiently bracing intellectual atmosphere; and the solution of that problem is complicated by the large number of persons in our graduate schools for whom academic life is unduly concerned with accumulating "credits" toward degrees. The promising young scholar too often finds a prevailingly low level of intellectual interest among his fellows, and loses much of the stimulus to which he is fairly entitled.

The need for more exacting tests in the selection of research students seems now even more urgent than in the early years of graduate instruction in this country. The kind of history which we now look for demands more of the scholar than was required in the days when history seemed so largely a matter of past politics. We are now increasingly impressed with the need of cross-fertilization, not only as between history and the other sciences usually called "social", but between the "social sciences" as a whole and such other studies, old and new, as literature, the fine arts, philosophy, psychology, and anthropology. This broadening of the field of interest is much to be desired; but if our "new history" is to win respect from trained workers in other fields by something more than a merely superficial interpretation of their results, our future historians must bring to their task a richer equipment and a more exacting discipline than most of us can claim. With due recognition of what may, indeed must, be done in the more mechanical operations of research, a new orientation such as we are now attempting seems to demand more than ordinary stress on the training of young scholars for intellectual leadership. A reconsideration of present requirements from this point of view is very much needed.

In discussing the obstacles to research by members of university faculties, and the responsibilities of administrative officers in this respect, something may well be said about the tendency of many teachers, even without administrative pressure, to dissipate their energies by attempting too many formal courses, by multiplying textbooks which do not always represent significant

contributions either in material or in new points of view, and in other ways which will occur to anyone familiar with the academic scene. These things, for which college presidents and deans are by no means wholly responsible, have their part in diverting energies which might otherwise be applied to improving the quality of instruction, as well as to research.

Columbia University. EVARTS B. GREENE.

The Idea of Progress: an Inquiry into its Origin and Growth. By J. B. BURY, Regius Professor of Modern History, and Fellow of King's College, in the University of Cambridge. Introduction by Charles A. Beard. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xl, 357. $2.50.)

IN 1920 I was almost as much astonished as delighted to learn that J. B. Bury had published a book entitled, *The Idea of Progress.* Delighted, because the subject was one that interested me greatly; astonished, because it was apparently so remote from the studies on which Bury's fame rested. At that time I was familiar with his *Greece,* having taught it (— *it,* rather than Greek history, of which otherwise I knew very little) to reluctant students. I was familiar with his two books on the Roman empire, and with the admirable introduction to his edition of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall.* And one sweltering, July day I had listened to a lecture which he delivered at the University of Kansas on Early Britain—a lecture which was, I thought, almost as dry as the day was humid. From all of which I got the impression that J. B. Bury was a most learned scholar whose statements of fact could invariably be relied upon, but whose "interpretation" of the facts would invariably be confined to the clarification of the immediate factual situation. In what professional historians condescendingly referred to as the "philosophy of history" I imagined him to be not at all interested, and might readily have classed him with those typical British scholars whom Taine had in mind when he wrote: "I am disgusted with everybody, dear Edouard. Germans make intolerable hypotheses, Frenchmen make none, Englishmen do not even suspect that one could make any" (*Life and Letters,* II. 35). Can it be, I thought, that J. B. Bury has written an entire book about an "idea", and not only about an idea, but about so interesting an idea as "progress"? I immediately got the book, found it of absorbing interest, found that it "illuminated" history as few history books ever do.

How it illuminated history I tried to express in a review of the book (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXVI. 77–78) to which I have little to add, since the text here printed is identical with that of the original edition. But to the present text is prefixed a valuable introduction by Charles A. Beard, who points out that Bury, in his cautious and discriminating way, had all his life been deeply interested in the significance of history as a whole, had reflected much and

written something on the "philosophy of history". It seems that all the time he was writing those terribly sound factual histories of Greece and Rome he was also making himself familiar with the general history of human ideas, and particularly with the ideas men have had about the significance of their own history. "I cannot imagine", he wrote as early as 1904, "the slightest theoretical importance of a collection of facts or sequence of facts, unless they mean something in terms of reason, unless we can hope to determine their vital connection in the whole system of reality." If one should object to this that Bury's own works appear to be concerned solely with determining, within narrowly chosen periods, exactly what happened, his answer would be: "the possibility of an interpretation of history as a movement of reason, disclosing itself in the nature of terrestrial circumstances, seems the only hypothesis on which the postulate of 'history for its own sake' can be justified as valid." So far, no doubt, this is just good Hegelian doctrine, qualified by Ranke's criticism that Hegel expounded the Idea realizing itself in the actual without taking the trouble to find out what the actual actually was; like Ranke, Bury fully appreciated the necessity of determining what actually happened before speculating on the great Idea that caused it to happen. Ranke found the key to the Idea in the "individuality of nations", each nation being, as one may say, drafted at the appropriate moment to make its peculiar contribution to the realization of the Idea. But Bury differed from Hegel and Ranke in this, that he refused to deify the Idea: for him the Idea was not a transcendent force dwelling in the shadowy world of absolute Being; it was no more than a pattern imposed on the factual reality by the minds of actual men. For Bury, therefore, the philosophy of history was to be sought in what Droysen called the "self-consciousness of humanity"; it would be humanity's consciousness of itself viewed in the perspective of the centuries. Such a philosophy of history would obviously not be something fixed, something predetermined, to which events must conform; it would be something always changing, an idea always being reshaped and enriched by experience.

Apparently what attracted Bury to this line of thought was the sharp contrast between the classical idea of finality and the modern idea of evolution. The Greeks were sufficiently aware of "how strange it is that man should be what he is and should have wrought all that he has wrought"; but the classical world scarcely went beyond that to ask whether man might accomplish much more in the future. It remained for the modern mind to "escape from the illusion of finality", and to conceive of an endless "evolution" toward something better. Bury's book is the systematic exposition of the stages by which the modern mind substituted for the classical notion of endlessly recurring cycles, and for the Christian notion of a heavenly felicity after death, the idea of a progressive perfecting of man's life on earth. Mr. Beard, in his introduction, having made it clear that Bury's work was the result of

a lifetime of reading and reflection, raises the interesting question of the relation of the idea of progress to the rapid changes and improvements brought about by technology. It is obviously easier to believe in progress in an age of rapid changes in the conditions of life than it would be in an age of stable conditions. What then will become of the dogma of progress when and if, as may very well be, the possibilities of invention and technological advance are exhausted? Bury did not raise this question; but he was far too acute not to realize that the fundamental premise of any doctrine of progress carries an implication that the doctrine itself will give way to something different. "Will not that process of change, for which Progress is the optimistic name, compel 'Progress', too, to fall from the commanding position in which it is now, with apparent security, enthroned?" The price which we must pay for the pleasure of "escaping from the illusion of finality" is the recognition that nothing, not even the realization that we have escaped from that illusion, is likely to endure. All philosophies based on the absolute and the unconditioned no doubt have their defects; but all philosophies based upon the universal relativity of things have their defects also; one of the chief being that they must be prepared, at the appropriate moment, to commit hara-kiri in deference to the ceaseless transformation which they postulate.

Cornell University. CARL BECKER.

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Storia della Magna Grecia. Per EMANUELE CIACERI, Professore Ordinario della Reale Università di Napoli. Volume III., *Decadenza e Fine degli Stati Italioti: Romanizzazione del Mezzogiorno d'Italia dalla Metà del IV Sec. A. C. al Sec. VI D. C.* (Rome: Albrighi, Segati and Company. 1932. Pp. xii, 351. 40 l.)

PROFESSOR CIACERI here brings to conclusion his great work on the Greek cities of southern Italy. The first and second volumes deal with their foundation and the period of their greatest splendor. The third volume for the most part records the story of their decline. In fact from the end of the third century B.C. to the sixth century of the Christian era only a few scattered references to these cities can be found, and for this period their history is almost a complete blank.

With the decline of Sybaris and Croton, Tarentum became the most important city of Magna Graecia. The clash with Rome was caused by an incident for which Ciaceri has no satisfactory explanation. In the days when Roman senators had little interest in trade, a treaty had been drawn up between the two states, and in one of the provisions Rome agreed to refrain from entering Tarentine waters with her ships. It is significant that she violated the treaty by sending a fleet to coast along the shores of southern

Italy soon after the democratic party had won its long struggle with the landowning aristocracy of the senate. The Tarentines attacked the fleet and war was declared. The motive of the Romans in breaking the treaty has never been clearly understood. It seems to me that we must seek an explanation in the character of the triumphant democracy of that period. The senatorial aristocracy consisted of landed proprietors whose wealth and influence had suffered from the depreciation of their holdings in Latium. The expansion of Rome in central Italy had however brought a considerable development of trade and commerce from which undoubtedly the plebeians had been the first to profit. We may conjecture that this party, eager for new and larger fields of exploitation, led the movement to challenge the treaty with Tarentum and to open the way to bring the profitable trade with the East into their own hands. Evidence for the commercial interests of the Romans at the time may be found in the currency reforms of 269 and the development of a fleet. A few years later when the menace of Carthaginian domination of the Straits of Messina arose, the senate took no action in the matter, but yielded its prerogative to the centuriate assembly, possibly under pressure exerted by the commercial interests of the democracy which realized more fully what Carthaginian control of this vital passage would mean to Roman trade. Finally the development of Adriatic piracy after the first Punic war is a clear indication of the importance of eastern trade at this time, and the firm measures taken by Rome to suppress Teuta show that the commercial interests were a prime consideration in Roman statecraft.

There is little doubt that, during the first Punic war, the cities of Magna Graecia furnished the bulk of the ships and marines for the Roman fleet. Unfortunately Roman historiography did not begin until after the Hannibalic war, when the annalists, animated by a spirit of hostility towards the Greek cities because of their defection to the invader, wilfully concealed their loyal services in the earlier struggle, and concocted the romantic myth of the construction of a purely Roman fleet and the fantastic tale of training a hundred thousand marines on rowing machines along the shore. Even the invention of the *corvus,* which Ciaceri ascribes to a Roman engineer, should be credited to the Greeks. The Syracusans used this device against the Athenians during the Peloponnesian war, and it must have been familiar to the naval engineers of Tarentum.

In the second Punic war Ciaceri ascribes the defection of Tarentum and other cities of southern Italy partly to internal dissensions and treachery, and partly to the fact that the foundation of a Roman colony at Brundisium and the development of this port had seriously injured the older trade routes to the south. But the alliance of Hannibal with Philip of Macedon, with Syracuse, and with the Greek cities of Magna Graecia seems to indicate that some wider and more fundamental principles of world politics were involved.

Greeks and Carthaginians, bitter commercial rivals, had never before made common cause. I would suggest that the Greeks, fully conscious of the dangerous new rivalry of Rome, sought by alliance with Carthage not so much to destroy Rome as to restore Carthage to a position where she could meet Rome on more equal terms. Possibly the Greek statesmen reasoned that if Hannibal won, as they had every right to expect after Cannae and the defection of Capua, the Greek cities would emerge from the struggle in the enviable position of neutral states lying between the great powers of the Western Mediterranean which would be more or less evenly balanced. They could thus secure favorable commercial terms from one or the other at any time as the price of their support. Be this as it may, it is easy after the event to see how badly the Greeks miscalculated the strength of the contestants. By casting in their lot with Hannibal, they earned the bitter resentment of the victors and, after the war was ended, confiscation of territory and loss of trade connections in Italy brought about a swift decline. The Greek element in southern Italy either died out or was merged by fusion with the neighboring indigenous tribes. The process of Latinization was accelerated by the planting of Roman colonies, but economic conditions were such that even this attempt to rehabilitate the ancient cities failed. In the imperial age the glory of Magna Graecia survived only as a literary tradition.

While Magna Graecia virtually disappears from the pages of history after the Hannibalic war it had already fulfilled an important part in the cultural development of Mediterranean civilization. When the West was slowly emerging from barbarism, the Greek colonies acted as interpreters and disseminators of the culture of the East. Ciaceri devotes the last two chapters of this volume to a sane and judicious study of the cultural development of southern Italy and its influence on Rome. In art, in religion, in law, and even in military theory and political institutions the Etruscans and later the Romans themselves learned much from Magna Graecia. Above all after the first Punic war there came to Rome from southern Italy Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius, and Pacuvius to whom belong the honor and glory of laying the first and firm foundations of Roman literature.

Princeton University. ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

Christianity in Celtic Lands: a History of the Churches of the Celts, their Origin, their Development, Influence, and Mutual Relations. By Dom LOUIS GOUGAUD, Benedictine Monk of St. Michael's Abbey, Farnborough. Translated from the Author's MS. by Maud Joynt. (London: Sheed and Ward. 1932. Pp. lxii, 458. 18*s*.)

IN his latest work the learned Benedictine has given us a synthesis of our present knowledge in his favorite field, the early history of the Church among the Celts. It is based on his *Chrétientés Celtiques* (Paris, 1911), but "revised,

corrected and considerably enlarged, with such improvements as the incessant researches and ripening process of the intervening twenty years have suggested" (p. vii). It is in reality a repertory of everything of value published before 1932.

The introduction contains a select bibliography (chronological and by subjects) of the works useful to the student (and others whose "faulty or quite uncritical" nature is pointed out), the works published since 1911 taking more than one-fourth of the space. This extensive bibliography (thirty-seven pages) is supplemented by copious references in footnotes to additional works and, especially, contributions to periodicals.

The treatment of so large a subject—though the period studied reaches to the twelfth century only—necessarily involves many unsolved questions. The author discusses these with a becoming caution, content to await the presentation of competent evidence after further research.

To the consideration of the questions involved, Dom Gougaud brings not only the instinct and the training of the historian, but, let it be said frankly, the indispensable qualification of an understanding of the spirit of Catholicism. For it must be admitted that the significance of the differences between the customs of Celtic Christians and those of other parts of the Church has been too much exaggerated. These differences were due to their stern "orthodoxy" in maintaining old customs which were at first only local or which had been changed on the Continent, particularly at Rome. The fundamental cause was their ignorance of authoritative pronouncements from Rome, and this, of course, was due to interruptions of communication between Rome and the far western fringe of Europe by the Nordic incursions. Yet it is noteworthy that they showed no rebellious spirit in matters of doctrine: they looked to the See of Peter for guidance in that, but they understood better than some modern writers the difference between doctrine and discipline. Catholics are amused at the lack of humor which interprets divergences of usage as to the shape of the tonsure or the date of Easter as evidence of schism or even of heresy! The author makes it quite clear that the Celtic churches were steadfast in maintaining communion with Rome both as to doctrine and as to orders, and in matters of discipline were willing to conform to Roman practice when they were shown that such practice had papal authority behind it. Even St. Columbanus's remonstrances with the pope over the Easter-date question (when he finally recognized there was a real question of obedience to authority at issue) give proof, strong as they are, that he realized that he must in loyalty give up his own view if the pope persisted in his!

At times one wishes that Dom Gougaud had gone into greater detail, or had cited opinions only referred to. But as a work of popularization the size of the book would have passed reasonable limits. The copious and detailed

references to fundamental sources and to discussions of particular problems provide a safe guide for those who wish to investigate further in this direction. Along with the first volume of Dr. Kenney's *Sources for the Early History of Ireland,* this volume takes first rank as a convenient and authoritative summary of our knowledge of the field treated.

The Catholic University of America. JAMES A. GEARY.

Dahlmann-Waitz, Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte. Auflage 9. Herausgegeben von HERMANN HAERING. *Registerband.* In Verbindung mit M. KELLER und S. SALLOCH, bearbeitet von HERMANN HAERING. (Leipzig: K. F. Koehler. 1931, 1932. Pp. 992; 993–1202. 60 M.)

MANY will recall the resonant article in the *Historische Zeitschrift* (CXXXVI., 1927) in which Dr. Haering discussed the principles which must be followed in a new edition of this standard bibliography of German history. By an act of poetic justice Dr. Haering has been chosen editor of the new *D.-W.,* and, assisted by a staff of fifty-four collaborators, after two and a half years of labor, the ninth edition has now appeared. The original edition of this first of modern historical bibliographies was published something more than a century ago; it was presently followed by *Pirenne* for Belgium, *Monod* for France, and *Barth* for Switzerland, who used it as a model but undertook corrections and improvements in structure and arrangement from which the later, especially the last, editions of the German bibliography greatly profited. No one will maintain that the present general plan of *D.-W.* is subject to serious criticism. It is a model of thoughtful planning and conscientious labor such as the world of scholars has a right to expect from the best traditions of German scholarship. *D.-W.* has adapted itself admirably to the expansive tendency of modern historical study. As each new edition has added new fields of interest, so the present edition adds a whole new section on "Auslanddeutschtum" and another on German colonial history. Notwithstanding the more extensive use of small type, abbreviations, and the accumulation of titles under a single number, the volume has increased its size by a third and the index appears as a separate volume. Yet the editor informs us of the heroic efforts he has made to prevent the new *D.-W.* from degenerating into a mere library catalogue, that he did not desire to compete with the *Jahresberichte der Deutschen Geschichte,* that he strove to have the work remain a handbook for students, in the best sense a *bibliographie raisonnée,* indispensable for those who do not live near large libraries where other more exhaustive bibliographies are available. The principle of Pirenne's bibliography, that it is intended neither for the bibliographer nor for the specialist but for the student, has become the guiding principle of the new *D.-W.,* although the specialist will continuously marvel at

the wealth of material to be found here. Not the least valuable innovation of the present edition is the constant reference to such larger bibliographies as the *Jahresberichte,* R. Bemmann's *Quellenkunde zur Sächsischen Geschichte,* G. Wolf's *Quellenkunde zur Reformationsgeschichte,* to mention only a few, which makes the new *D.-W.* indispensable even to the specialist. The generosity with which cross references have been added everywhere enhances the usefulness of the new edition. There is a reasonable presumption that the search for a particular title, if it proves fruitless under one head, will eventually be successful under another, although this often requires a great deal of paging.

Yet the new *D.-W.* is not without certain grave defects which, it must be added, the editor is the first to admit in his preface. His effort to prevent the size of the volume from becoming unhandy has induced him to employ a system of abbreviations and symbols often so cryptic that they will be a source of constant difficulty to the non-German user. Not all the collaborators are equally competent masters of their respective fields, for, receiving no remuneration for their arduous labor, they had to be chosen where they could be found. Not all contributors have strictly adhered to the principle of the *bibliographie raisonnée.* The sections on the economic and constitutional history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries leave much to be desired. On some sections one cannot entirely dispense with the old edition. Due to the want of means in certain local German libraries some contributors have not had the necessary bibliographical helps at their disposal. The editor intended to improve on the old edition by adding the year of publication in all references to periodical literature, but in almost one-fourth of the references this could not be done. The British and American student will find that the French literature which has appeared since 1912 is more adequately represented than works in the English language. In some cases this may have been due to the inability of German libraries to purchase the books but in others it is due to undeniable shortcomings on the part of the contributor. The author of the section on the political history from 1740 to 1786, for example, is clearly unfamiliar with the not inconsiderable English literature on this period. It goes without saying that it is impossible in a work of this sort to satisfy all wishes. Yet there are certain inclusions and omissions which are difficult to pardon.

The reviewer may be permitted to select at random a few instances from his own list of corrections. In the section on the history of the Christian religion, 3442, one misses fundamental studies like Karl Adam, *Wesen des Katholizismus* (1925), F. Heiler, *Der Katholizismus* (1923); under 3349 the four volumes of G. G. Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion* are not mentioned; nor, under 8786, is Luigi Nina, *Le Finanze Pontifice nel Medio Evo* (1929). While G. Wolf's section on the Reformation is as admirable as his

larger bibliography, he has omitted, under 10,089, Ernst Correll, *Das Schweizerische Täufermennonitentum* (1925), one of the best of all studies on the Anabaptists. Under 14,923, Priebatsch, *Geschichte des Preussischen Offizierkorps* (1920), is omitted; likewise, under 12,523, E. Dette, *Friedrich der Grosse und sein Heer* (1914). While the authors have devoted no little space to the war-time propaganda of the Entente there is nothing on the German patriotic and propaganda societies such as the "Alldeutscher Verband", the "Ostmark Verein", the "Wehrverein", and "Jung Deutschland", to mention only a few of them.

Ohio State University. WALTER L. DORN.

Die Weltstellung des Deutschen Reiches, 911–1047. Von ALEXANDER CARTELLIERI, Professor an der Universität Jena. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1932. Pp. xxxviii, 513. 30 M.)

WITH this volume Professor Cartellieri offers a rather ponderous continuation of his *Weltgeschichte als Machtgeschichte, 382–911, Die Zeit der Reichsgründungen* (1927). His forty-seven short chapters he divides into three books: Der Aufstieg des Deutschen Reiches (911–967), Das Deutsch-Römische Kaisertum (967–1002), and Der Hohepunkt des Deutschen Kaisertums (1002–1047). But these titles, as well as the titles of some of the chapters, are not to be taken too seriously as an accurate indication of the contents. For Cartellieri's concern is not with German history alone; nor again, does his method of treatment lead up to the climax that the titles of his three books would lead us to expect. He is concerned essentially with *Weltgeschichte,* with Germany in a world of European and Mediterranean powers, Byzantium, Islam, the Slav world, Italy, the Papacy, France, England, the Scandinavian north; and certainly his history of such a world is too like a mere chronicle of events to leave any impression of a line of development.

Indeed, Cartellieri is writing history of a strictly limited sort, such as we no longer expect in a general work that promises so much in the title. It is good old-fashioned political and military history, and that without relief for it lacks even the embellishments of rhetoric. The entire omission of all other material by an author who insists that power must be based on a *gesunde Wirtschaft, gerechte Verfassung, und freies Geistesleben,* is therefore a serious objection to a work that aims to demonstrate the predominance of the German empire during this period. Cartellieri himself must have felt this lack when he apologizes for dismissing the Ottonian ecclesiastical policy with a few sentences. The objection becomes the more serious when we remember that it is not simply German history that the author is narrating. The interrelations of his world were not simply political and military. By choosing largely to ignore all other factors, he presents a one-sided picture, and make no use of the opportunity to instruct by comparison.

What unity the book has, comes through chronology. One goes forward if at all only by groups of years. A chapter on Lorraine between East and West (911–925), contains indeed the history of Lorraine during these years but it contains also the political history of Germany, France, Italy, the Papacy, and Byzantium for the same period; a chapter on Henry II. and the Reform of the Church (1015–1024), while it does include a statement of Henry's attempts at reform, deals with the history of France, Italy, and Germany. There are certainly advantages in this concatenation in time which is likely to bring together facts not usually associated in one's mind, but to move from Lemnos to Armenia and to Lorraine in less than a page does not necessarily make history more intelligible than a topical arrangement. Chronology is hardly the answer to the problem of how to write world history.

One must not, however, detract from the general utility of the work. Although it is not a book that the present reviewer could read continuously with any great satisfaction, it is a sound reference work for military and political events. It is recent in its scholarship. It is accurate. Cartellieri is careful to locate every place mentioned and to give dates as precisely as possible. Its constant use of analogy is generally helpful, although one might object, for example, to finding in Leo of Vercelli a modest forerunner of Dante and in Boleslav Chabri a forerunner of Panslavism. There is not a map in the book. We can, however, hardly fail to be grateful to Professor Cartellieri for giving us a condensed and up-to-date *Jahrbuch* going so far beyond the confines of German history.

The University of Nebraska. EDGAR N. JOHNSON.

Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100 to 1291. By JOHN L. LA MONTE, Assistant Professor of History, the University of Cincinnati. [Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America, no. 4.] (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1932. Pp. xxviii, 293. $4.50.)

THIS excellent survey of feudal government in the crusading states supplants Dodu's *Institutions Monarchiques dans le Royaume Latin de Jérusalem,* published in 1894. Since that date there has been much laboring in and around this field and the author of the present work has reaped the harvest. But his book excels even more in critical scholarship. After all, little has been added to the sources which were available to Dodu. He had most of the volumes of the *Académie des Inscriptions.* Even Röhricht's *Regesta,* which had appeared in 1893, is listed in his bibliography, and the author is not justified in saying, as he does in his preface, that "Dodu was particularly unfortunate in having written before Röhricht's *Regesta Regni Hierosolimitani* had appeared". Evidently chronicles seemed more important to Dodu than charters, and an examination of his footnotes will show that he did not use the literary sources very critically.

The first part of Dr. La Monte's book is a constitutional history of the Latin kingdom. While the monarchy was elective, it was stronger than when it became hereditary. The elective kings, of course, ruled while the kingdom was on the make, whereas the hereditary monarchs reigned when the Latin state was declining, and were not persons of dominating personality. Feudalism on this new far flung frontier of Christendom did not yield to either absolute or constitutional monarchy as it did in the West. It preserved the decentralization of twelfth century France. The *Haute Court* remained a court of the vassals, and did not become the instrument of centralized monarchical government. Although Amaury was strong enough to obtain the *Assise sur la ligece,* a sort of Salisbury Oath which made all arrière vassals liegemen of the king, his successors were too weak and had too many troubles to make this law effective.

The failure of the monarchy to master the feudal lords is explained more fully in book II., which describes the administrative machinery of the kingdom. Perhaps the most original contribution in this section is the description of the chancery. Book III. describes the relations of the kings with Tripoli, Antioch, and Edessa, with the Church and the military orders, and with the Italian communes or commercial colonies. With Saracen enemies without, and independent lords, churchmen, Templars, Hospitallers, and merchants within their kingdom, it is not difficult to see why the kings of Jerusalem did not go far on the road to absolutism.

Whether the feudalism described in the *Assises* was more pure and perfect than that which existed in the West is immaterial. As Professor McIlwain says, "The word 'feudalism' is little more than a rough generalization or formula under which we try to include such conditions, economic, social, and governmental, as are found to be common and uniform . . . in that obscure period of rapid change between the dismembering of the Carolingian Empire and the growth of national states" (*Cam. Med. Hist.,* VII. 664). The transplanted feudalism of the Latin kingdom was conservative. It clung tenaciously to its original principles. Perhaps for that very reason, as the author suggests, it held its ground longer in the East than centralized monarchy could have done.

The method of treatment leads to some repetition, but few mistakes have been noted. Von Seybel, which appears twice, is evidently a misprint for Von Sybel, and Rohard and Renaud were chamberlains not marshals as stated on page 122. Several appendixes, including lists of officials to which the author has made additions, are very helpful. It is gratifying to know that the author is at work on a sequel, a study of the kingdom of Cyprus.

The University of Texas. F. Duncalf.

The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII.: Selected Letters from the Registrum. Translated with an Introduction by Ephraim Emerton,

Winn Professor of Ecclesiastical History (Emeritus), Harvard University. [Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies, Volume XIV., edited under the Auspices of the Department of History, Columbia University, Austin P. Evans, General Editor.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1932. Pp. xxxi, 212. $3.50.)

PROFESSOR EMERTON spreads before the reader a panorama of papal activities during the pontificate of Gregory VII. The letters chosen are more than merely representative; they contain almost the entire substance of the great pope's correspondence. Of course no selection can completely satisfy every one. Some of the letters sent to the frontiers of Christendom might be replaced with others concerning the affairs of France. The three letters in the second book which deal with the offenses of the bishop of Poitiers illustrate delightfully the difficulties which faced the church reformers. Should we not also have had Gregory's decision in the ancient feud which grew out of the claims of both Tours and Dol to metropolitan authority over the churches of Brittany? On the whole, however, no one of the omissions is important enough to detract seriously from the value of the collection.

Only one major criticism may be made of Professor Emerton's work. In a collection of source material intended primarily for the use of non-specialists, the introduction and notes are of fundamental importance. While Professor Emerton's introduction is in general satisfactory, one is rather surprised to find no discussion of the Cluniac reform movement as part of the background for Gregory's ideals. There are very few notes, and these are not always fortunate. For instance, the editor has, apparently at least, missed the point of the letter to the monks of Romans-sur-Isère which provided for the transformation of this house into an establishment of regular canons. Professor Emerton does not pretend "to comment exhaustively upon each individual letter", but brief notes explaining the significance of the various epistles would be of immense assistance to students. As it stands this book can hope to achieve its full utility only when used in connection with the lectures of a medievalist.

It would, in my opinion, be difficult to overpraise Professor Emerton's mastery of the art of translation. He has transferred the meaning, spirit, and mode of expression of the Latin originals into simple and distinguished English. Unfortunately he did not always take sufficient note of the context. *Rebus vero sancti Petri quae in Anglia colliguntur* obviously refers to special papal revenues such as Peter's pence and cannot be rendered accurately as "the property of St. Peter in England". Again, in the letter to Beatrice and Matilda about Bishop Werner of Strasbourg *venit* cannot mean "is now on his way hither" as the context makes clear that the bishop had already left Rome on his homeward journey.

The translator of these letters has performed a very real service for teachers and students of medieval history. Expressing his own doubts as to the

value of his work, Professor Emerton mentions the common criticism of translations of source material: "those who really care about the matter can and will use the original, and others need not be considered at all". In an age when innumerable college teachers, to say nothing of graduate and undergraduate students, have a most meager, if any, command of Latin, this argument has little weight. The future effectiveness of the teaching of medieval history depends very largely on the production of more books of this variety.

The Johns Hopkins University. SIDNEY PAINTER.

Economic and Social History of Europe in the Later Middle Ages, 1300–1530. By JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON, Professor of Medieval History in the University of Chicago. [The Century Historical Series.] (New York: Century Company. 1931. Pp. viii, 545. $5.00.)

THIS volume is a continuation of the author's *Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages, 300–1300,* which appeared in 1928 (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXIV. 299). It is designed for the student and general reader who has only English, and does not compete with or replace such careful and judicious manuals as R. Kötzschke's *Allgemeine Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Jena, 1924) and J. Kulischer's *Allgemeine Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit,* volume I. (Munich and Berlin, 1928), to which the specialist will go.

The new volume serves well the purpose for which it was designed. The non-specialist will gain from it, by and large, a vivid impression of the economic and social activity, resourcefulness, and versatility of the later medieval period. He will, it must be confessed, be puzzled, rather frequently, by contradictory statements, which, however, usually relate to subordinate matters. These contradictions should have been caught in the preparation of the index. For example: annates were a year's income (p. 12), a half-year's income (p. 289); the Flanders galley route was opened in 1317 (p. 90), in 1314 (p. 246); under Charles V. French industry and commerce made great progress (p. 117), and *contra* (p. 123); France established permanent domination over Genoa in 1396 (p. 243), lost it in 1400 (p. 303), and held it 1396 to 1409 (p. 321); and the failure of the alum supply was in large part responsible for the ultimate decay of the Florentine cloth industry (p. 281), and a new and wonderful find in the papal lands furnished a superior quality and a large quantity of it (pp. 297–298). A few verbal incongruities appear in the same statement, as "The Boro-Russians, or Prussians, . . . were a people of Lettish race, kindred to the Finns. . . ." "They were fisher folk and fur-hunters and, like all Slavs, bee-keepers" (p. 180).

Another type of slip (three cases were noticed in perusing the book) results from inadequate quotation. Vinogradoff's summary of Page's idea that the Black Death "set the stone rolling in the direction of commutation" is im-

plicitly given as Vinogradoff's own view, and Vinogradoff's criticism (*i.e.*, that the Black Death did not originate this movement) of Page's idea appears as Thompson's correction of Vinogradoff (p. 394, and note).

The author has a few whimsies (what author has not?). He thinks that good manners declined ominously during the period under the influence of the bourgeoisie—he tells us so thrice (pp. 9, 384, 497–498)—that the bourgeois, as *parvenus*, were not interested in building churches, and, being without traditions of higher culture, preferred flamboyant architecture (p. 493). His opinion that there was "a rebellion of the business mind of the later Middle Ages against the Church's prohibition of interest" (p. 499) is rather hard, this reviewer thinks, on Thomas Aquinas and the canon lawyers, who showed the men of business how to secure interest legitimately.

These adverse criticisms, it should be borne in mind, relate to details and *obiter dicta*, and should not be taken as representing an adverse judgment on the learned author's achievement.

The University of Wisconsin. G. C. Sellery.

BOOKS OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Economic History of England. By E. Lipson, M.A., Reader in Economic History in the University of Oxford. Volumes II. and III., *The Age of Mercantilism.* (London: A. and C. Black; New York: Macmillan Company. 1931. Pp. viii, 464; v, 542. $5.00 each.)

The fact that Mr. Lipson's first volume is now in its fifth edition is ample proof of its value to economic and other historians. It is more than a reviewer's *cliché* to say that we have waited eagerly for the appearance of its successors. Now that the two new volumes are before us, we must admire a courage that remained undaunted in the face of the mountain of printed sources waiting to be examined. Even where a subject has been "monographed" Mr. Lipson has not been satisfied with secondary sources or with other men's interpretations. Instead, he has insisted on ploughing a long lonely furrow; he has endeavored to keep clear of the views and theories of others, and it is perhaps no accident that the name of Sombart does not appear in the bibliography.

The field covered ranges from the Elizabethan Age to the Industrial Revolution; it is called the Age of Mercantilism, though we have to wait till volume III. before we are told what mercantilism is. Onto that field the author steps without first taking a walk round it; he does not believe in the ancient practice of "beating the bounds"; or, to vary the metaphor, he divides his terrain into six fields, cuts each up into long narrow strips, and describes each strip. I wish his brilliant, bird's-eye survey of the period, published in the *Journal of Economic and Business History* for August, 1932, could be

printed as an introduction to the second edition, to guide the student through the jungle of special studies of which the work consists.

The book is divided into six long chapters. First comes a picture of the position and organization of five textile trades, coal, and iron. Then under the heading of foreign trade we have descriptions of ten trading companies, but no study of the colonizing companies. Agriculture comes next, and is given only ninety-four pages (including the Corn Market and the Corn Laws)—surely an inadequate quota. Volume III. opens with 200 pages on the Mercantile System, including the protection of industry, money, and the balance of trade—this is a long survey of the pamphlet literature—the navigation and colonial systems, and Ireland. The next two hundred pages contain an omnibus chapter on capital and finance, wages, technical training, unemployment, the standardization of industry, the craft guilds, patents of monopoly, and trade unionism. The final chapter deals with the relief of the poor.

On nearly every topic Mr. Lipson brings forth new facts; but in addition certain general theses stand out which will seem new to many readers. Perhaps the chief is that of the continuity of economic development. Time after time, in different keys, the theme rings out that "there is no hiatus in economic development, but always a constant tide of progress and change, in which the old is blended almost imperceptibly with the new". There is no sudden ending of the Middle Ages, no sudden outbreak of the Industrial Revolution. The features which we regard as essentially medieval live on with surprising vitality, and the characteristics of the modern age—capitalism in all its forms, congregation of workers in large groups under the employer's roof, integration, combinations, labor problems, business fluctuations, credit, etc.—have been developing for three centuries, at least, and were part of the economic order long before the textile inventions or the steam engine. "The Antiquity of Modernity" might almost serve as a subtitle for the book. The developments of the nineteenth century were new in degree, not in kind. In his eagerness to establish this thesis Mr. Lipson possibly goes too far; he watches so keenly for signs of the new order that perhaps he underestimates the tenacity with which old forms and ideas survived over large areas of industry, agriculture, and trade.

One closes the book wondering what is the content of economic history. All through the study we are looking at types of organization, at problems of state control, at controversies. Every chapter in volume III. has the word "state" or "national" in the first sentence, and the biggest sections in the book drag us back endlessly to ordinances, statutes, or the outpourings of controversialists. But never do we hear the blow of a hammer, the clatter of a shuttle, the "Gee up!" of a ploughman, the bang of a desk lid, or the flapping of canvas over a becalmed ship. Is economic history only, or even mainly, a branch of political or constitutional history, a study of economic

physiology? Ashley was frank when he called his little red book *The Economic Organisation of England*. For that side of the story the documents are available, and Mr. Lipson has done a splendid job on them. But it tends to be impersonal, bloodless. I talked a few weeks ago with a man who had worked a hand spinning-jenny and a handloom in the days before the Crimean War, and from him I caught glimpses of life, labor, and leisure such as never got into the pages of a royal commission report. The trouble lies in the lack of material; the rescue of business records may help us to catch glimpses of the past two or three centuries; but for the rest the breath is not available by which the dry bones can be made to live.

The University of Minnesota. HERBERT HEATON.

The Works of Samuel de Champlain. Reprinted, translated, and annotated under the General Editorship of H. P. BIGGAR. Volume IV., 1608–1620. Translated by H. H. LANGTON, the French Text collated by J. HOME CAMERON. [Publications of the Champlain Society.] (Toronto: the Society. 1932. Pp. xvi, 373.)

THIS volume IV. of the works of Samuel de Champlain is to be followed by two more to complete the definitive edition that includes all of Champlain's works with, for the first time, a complete English translation. The book consists of books III. and IV. that conclude part 1 of *Les Voyages de la Nouvelle France Occidentale* published in 1632, and covers material in earlier volumes: the founding of Quebec, the ill-advised sharing in war on the Iroquois, the abortive effort to reach the northern sea (Hudson Bay) overland, the winter among the Hurons. In addition, Champlain tells of his efforts in France down to 1620 to organize the fur trade so as to avoid ruinous competition. These efforts resulted later in Richelieu's Company of New France of which the story will come in the later volume. Champlain died in 1635, three years after the publication of *Les Voyages*. It shows the interest concerning Canada of the time that this large book was reissued in 1640. By that time the Jesuit *Relations* on Canada were being widely read in religious circles in France.

Since Champlain was not a master of literary French, Mr. Langton is to be congratulated on his translation into correct and lucid English of many rather clumsy phrases. He has allowed himself a certain liberty, for, as he notes, the critic has the French text before him and can judge for himself. This French text has proved troublesome. For the edition of 1632 Champlain supplemented his own early books by using the *Relation* of the Jesuit father Biard (1616). Naturally he was not a skilled editor. He corrected some errors, repeated others, and in some places either he or the printer made nonsense of the text. The present rendering based on careful examination of all existing editions may be regarded as final.

The native whom Champlain describes had not yet been corrupted by the

fire water and other evils from Europe. He was what conditions in America had made him, with qualities, some admirable, some the reverse. A school of anthropologists in our time is disposed to challenge the opinion that primitive man is warlike and brutal. Yet Champlain found the natives incessantly at war, incredibly cruel in waging it, and haunted by fears that caused fertile areas to remain untenanted and drove some tribes to a hard struggle for life in the remote and unfriendly wilderness. On the other hand the tribes visited by Champlain were uniformly friendly to the stranger, no matter what warfare existed among themselves. In Corsica to-day the vendetta does not affect the outsider.

Though Champlain crossed the Atlantic many times in small ships and in discomfort lasting for long weeks, he is so much at home on the sea that he dismisses a long voyage in a sentence. His whole heart is in the work of discovery. He says of his abortive effort, with all but incredible toil, to reach the northern sea, that he forgot all his past hardships at a moment when he had what proved an elusive gleam of success. He furnishes a glimpse of the intimidation in trade that is copied by the modern "racketeer". When traders at La Rochelle refused to accept restrictions on the trade to Canada imposed by royal authority, the mayor supported them by warning those who urged obedience that they "would run the risk of being drowned in the river harbour" and that he might not "be able to amend matters", which no doubt means inability to punish the evil doers.

The University of Toronto. GEORGE M. WRONG.

Correspondentie van Willem III. en van Hans Willem Bentinck, eersten Graaf van Portland. Uitgegeven door Dr. N. JAPIKSE. Gedeelte II., *Uit Engelsche en Nederlandsche Archieven en Bibliotheken.* Deel I. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1932. Pp. xxii, 659.)

THE historian-archivist who undertakes to present the correspondence of William III., stadholder and king, and that of his most trusted friend and servant, runs risks of overwhelming his readers, and of being himself overwhelmed, by the great masses of material extant. In his early twenties William was recognized as the savior of the United Netherlands; he was rapidly becoming the hope of Protestant Europe and of that part of Catholic Europe which feared France. In the two years covered by this volume,[1] 1672–1674, the frail thread of his life was already shuttling through vast webs of diplomacy and war from which death alone was to part it. A personage of such importance received and sent letters unceasingly. Even Dr. Japikse, who entered upon his task with a ripe appreciation of its mass and difficulties, admits surprise at the sheer bulk of William's correspondence. To reduce

[1] Nominally the volume covers the period 1656–1674, but only 39 of the 670 documents published *in extenso* derive from the years before 1672.

this bulk he has omitted the letters already published in two well-known collections: Sir John Dalrymple's *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland,* and Groen van Prinsterer's *Archives ou Correspondance Inédite de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau.* Further, he has limited his search to material in Dutch and English libraries and archives, although, as he suggests, systematic search in those of Belgium, Germany, and Austria would probably be rewarding. Further still, some 856 documents of minor importance are listed at the end of the volume, each with date, place of origin, the identifying name, and a line descriptive of the content. Long memorials on political conditions in foreign lands drawn up by Dutch envoys, and their lengthy accounts of formal audiences, even when addressed to William, have been excluded. Such documents, says the editor, have slight importance for a work whose definite purpose is to inform concerning the life and acts of an individual (p. xxi). But he is careful to present such part of the interchanges of diplomacy as serves to throw light on the stadholder's motives and policy. All this labor of discrimination and selection has been performed by Dr. Japikse with such excellent judgment that the reader cannot fail to be impressed with the continuity of the story of William's life and the evolution of his character recorded in these documents. It is true that time and chance, relentless simplifiers of human record, have deleted beyond recovery much that was written. Many years of William's adult life were spent in camps where it was impossible to maintain an ordered archive, "being obliged", he explained to Amerongen, "to run hither and yon like a post-horse" (p. 236). Though he was by no means unconcerned about the opinion of posterity, he did not express that concern by preserving copies of his own letters, or the originals of those addressed to him, except when he attached political importance to them as was the case with the documents now in King William's Chest in the Public Record Office in London. The net result of all subtractions is the 670 letters contained in this volume, most of which are either not in print or not readily accessible. Though Bentinck's name is retained on the title page, almost nothing of his has survived for these years. William is the sender or the receiver of these letters. Clearly the prince wrote or dictated the communications he signed, for his letters have, as his editor observes, "a ring of their own". Very seldom is this a note of personal feeling, informally expressed. The notes to Baron von Friesheim, written when William was fifteen, are affectionately reproving. And he must have liked the Earl of Ossory: "Vous estez l'homme du monde le plus paresseus", he tells him in 1671 (p. 39); and in 1674 he wishes Ossory had been present at the battle of Senef (p. 472). To Waldeck and Van Reede he unbent, was frank towards them and confident of their loyalty and devotion. To his other correspondents he wrote *en prince,* but without egotism or passion, always succinctly, firmly, objectively: "Quand les maux sont incurables, il y a long-

temps que j'ay appris a m'en consoler", he told Fagel (p. 487), and it was true.

Although Dr. Japikse's work is of first importance to students of the life of William III., it will be highly valued by all who are interested in the crisis in the life of the Dutch Republic occasioned by the French invasion of 1672. The state was unprepared for this terrific shock, as William himself was unprepared. Both, the reader of these letters will be apt to think, were saved by sheer firmness. William was not the only Hollander resolved to die in the last ditch rather than yield: witness Fagel's letter, written on July 1, 1672, when the fortunes of the republic had reached their nadir. He reported the indignation with which the provinces not yet in the grip of the French had repelled Louis's conditions of peace. "And as for me", wrote Fagel with emotion, "I would ten times rather die, if that might be, than become a wretched slave of France and involve posterity in open ruin of soul and body." The mistakes of the ruling class in the years which preceded this war had been many, but it was the spirit of this class which now "held the skies suspended" over the republic.

Vassar College. VIOLET BARBOUR.

Stanhope: a Study in Eighteenth-Century Diplomacy. By BASIL WILLIAMS. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. xv, 478. $5.00.)

"COURAGEOUS in war and peace, and one of the greatest of our foreign ministers, Stanhope has been strangely neglected by historians of his own race." An article in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* J. E. Edwards's indifferent, hundred-page summary, and a worse, unsigned tabloid in the *Britannica* represent the independent efforts in English to make him live. The present work, therefore, fills a gap in English biography.

Professor Williams describes Stanhope's share in the capture of Gibraltar while he was the protégé of the more-than-eccentric Earl of Peterborough, the ubiquitious and self-appointed diplomat of the time. Stanhope was partly responsible for the English defeat at Almanza, and seems almost to have invited the disaster at Brihuega. His most significant military achievement, the author points out, was the capture of Minorca. He joined in the successful opposition to the commercial clauses of the Treaty of Utrecht. He was also very active in the Whig *coup d'état* of 1714, and in suppressing the Jacobite rebellion of the following year. To him is largely due the flowering of the Treaty of Utrecht into three decades of peace and prosperity for England. The Treaty of Westminster, the Triple Alliance, and the so-called Quadruple Alliance bound up most of the wounds left gaping by the peace of 1713–1714, and are lasting monuments to his tact and political vision. What an interesting time this peripatetic "knight errant of diplomacy" must

have had in matching wits with the Regent, Dubois, John Law, Alberoni, Elisabeth Farnese, Victor Amadeus II., Frederick William I., Peter the Great, and Charles XII.! The blame for splitting the Whigs in 1717 rests, not with him, but with Sunderland and George I., whereas the credit for reuniting the party must go to Stanhope. He had no responsibility for the South Sea Bubble and no financial interest in the company. He was thoroughly incorruptible, and by his uprightness gave to political life a high tone, which it soon lost under Walpole. His early death was the inevitable outcome of a quarter century's assiduous cultivation of the bottle.

The work under review is preëminently scholarly and judicious. The author's extensive knowledge of the tangled skein of European politics gives him a sureness of touch in interpreting Stanhope's career. His mastery of the earlier part of the period leaves something to be desired, but his account of British diplomacy for the first half of the reign of George I. is by all odds the clearest and most satisfactory in English. The errors noted are few indeed. Charles Montagu was never a viscount (p. 153). Marlborough's real threat to resign came early in 1710, not in the previous year. The author probably errs in describing the retinue accompanying Boufflers during his peace parleys with Portland in 1697, "as a brilliant cortège of 500 courtiers". Stepney, probably the ablest English diplomat of the time, talked to these officers, who "seem to wish peace more than wee doe, and by appearance they made, certainly stand more in need of it; for they looked dejected, and the best of them were cloath'd, mounted and accoutred but very indifferently".

Professor Williams's account is based largely upon the more available manuscripts in English libraries, while for the archival materials of Berlin, Vienna, and Hanover he has depended largely upon secondary works. In rewriting Stanhope's military exploits he would have done well to examine the abundant manuscript collections at the Dépôt de la Guerre and the Archives de la Marine in Paris. The manuscripts at the Rijksarchief (The Hague) might also cast some light upon the Dutch reluctance to join the Quadruple Alliance. Unfortunately this excellent book lacks an annotated bibliography. It is a pity that so valuable a portion of a scholarly contribution should be treated so casually. The index is so brief as to be somewhat disappointing.

Indiana University. WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN.

The Letters of David Hume. Edited by J. Y. T. GREIG. Two volumes. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. xxxii, 532; 498. $15.00.)

THIS is a definitive edition. The efforts of the editor make it improbable that any considerable number of Hume's letters remain undiscovered; moreover, the editorial work is done so carefully that it will not need doing over.

The collection consists of 544 letters written by Hume. Of these, sixty have not hitherto been published and fifty have not been published in England or America. Where the autographs still exist, they have been transcribed with all peculiarities of spelling and punctuation. Seventy-one, of which extracts only have hitherto been published, are now published in full. This is the first edition in which the whole extant body of Hume's correspondence has been included. The editor has added twelve appendixes including chiefly letters addressed to Hume. The annotation is excellent. It gives all the information about persons and events needed in reading the letters; it is genuinely learned without being dull; and it does not overload the text.

Hume's letters unluckily have little to offer the historian of philosophy. From the period when he was doing his original work there are only three—to Francis Hutcheson in 1739–1740 (nos. 13, 15, and 16)—that have to do with his speculations. He was clearly not the man to conduct his education under the eyes of his friends, and this is not surprising when we reflect that his originality was not appreciated by any writer before Kant. Nor do the letters form what is usually called a personal document. They are revealing, but they reveal the sort of character which Hume himself described in the concluding paragraph of *My Own Life*. Professor Greig states the case well in his introduction (pp. xxi f.): "The extant letters . . . reveal most sides of David Hume the man—his precocity of intellect, his independent spirit, his kindliness of heart, his love of fun, books, whist, good company, old claret, and rich and well-cooked food, his pleasant vanities, the laziness that grew upon him after 1759, his readiness to think too highly of his friends and any books they happened to produce, his admiration for the French, his prejudice against the Churches, all 'enthusiasts', the Whigs, and Englishmen, his general but not unbroken equanimity of temper, and his fine common sense."

It is an interesting group of correspondents to which Hume's letters introduce us. First and foremost, there is the extraordinary group of Edinburgh men of letters and of affairs, who went far to justify Hume's belief in the superiority of the Scotch to the English: Adam Smith, William Robertson, Adam Ferguson, Francis Hutcheson, Lord Kames, Hugh Blair, Gilbert Elliot of Minto, and James Oswald of Dunnikier. In the second place there are Hume's friends and acquaintances in France: the Comtesse de Boufflers, with whom alone Hume carried on an intimate correspondence, Montesquieu, Turgot, and of course, Rousseau. Not the least interesting are the letters to his publishers, Andrew Millar and William Strahan. Finally, there is a small and rather miscellaneous group of letters to Englishmen: Horace Walpole, the Earl of Hardwicke, Edward Gibbon. A letter to the last (no. 516), in which Hume acknowledges the gift of the first volume of the *Decline and Fall* and which Gibbon says "repaid the labour of ten years", includes this characteristic slap at the English: "I own, that if I had not

previously had the Happiness of your personal Acquaintance, such a Performance, from an Englishman in our Age, would have given me some Surprize."

Hume is not a man who can be easily classified either in the categories of his own or of a later time. His skepticism cut the supposedly rational foundations from under natural theology as completely as the latter had undermined revelation. Similarly, the frank utilitarianism of his political and social philosophy destroyed the traditional principles both of Toryism and Whiggism. And yet Hume more than shared the dislike of his age for what he called "enthusiasm" and "faction". Temperamentally, he was in religion the perfect rationalist, who nevertheless knew that religion had nothing to do with reason. In politics he became ever more conservative, though he lacked utterly the sentimentalities upon which conservatism flourishes, and his social philosophy was substantially that of the Benthamite radicals two generations later. Thus Hume stands in relation to divergent schools both of thought and policy without belonging to either. His skeptical dissolution of rationalism cleared the way for the romantic glorification of sentiment and tradition, and yet no one would have abhorred this result more than Hume. His utilitarianism prepared the theories of the philosophical radicals, but in Hume's day the party lines were not yet drawn in England for the contest over *laissez faire*. In this connection one wonders whether, as an historian, Hume has received entire justice. The *History* is certainly a compilation, but the request for books not available at Edinburgh (now first published in letters 173, 174), to which Mr. Greig calls special attention, shows that Hume was not always satisfied with the materials he had at hand. Moreover, nineteenth century liberals were not always perfectly objective in their judgment on constitutional questions, any more than eighteenth century Whigs.

Cornell University. GEORGE H. SABINE.

Correspondance Inédite, 1789, 1790, 1791, du Marquis de Ferrières, Député de la Noblesse aux États Généraux. Publiée et annotée par HENRI CARRÉ, Doyen Honoraire de la Faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. [Les Classiques de la Révolution Française, publiés sous la Direction de M. Albert Mathiez.] (Paris: Armand Colin. 1932. Pp. xvi, 468. 50 fr.)

THE title "Classics of the French Revolution" is here somewhat misleading, for Ferrières's letters are now printed for the first time. The *Mémoires* of this rather obscure Constituant, deputy of the nobility of the Saumurois, were published in 1798, and later reprinted in three volumes in the Baudoin collection. This *Correspondance*, composed chiefly of letters from the deputy to his wife back home in Poitou, has been preserved intact in family archives. It is well worth resurrecting. There is in this book little new in the strictest

sense of the word—little new light on matters of disputed fact, little occasion for new judgments on political history. Ferrières talked little, and did less, in his three years as deputy, and the official historians of republican France would once doubtless have held these intimate letters of slight use. That two French university professors should have had a hand in publishing them today is another sign of changing fashions in the writing of history. For, if Ferrières has little to add to the political history of the Revolution, he is not without interest for its social history. There are literally hundreds of items of this sort: "On a établi des ventilateurs [in the hall of the Assembly]. On l'arrose deux fois au moins pendant chaque séance, avec un mélange de vinaigre et de parfum" (p. 231); or "j'aime encore mieux que Coucaud se croie mon égal, que de voir un Grand me croire son inférieur, et m'assimiler presque aux gens qu'il gage, et qu'il nourrit" (p. 120). Nor, as can be judged from this last quotation, are such items simply of a lively and picturesque interest. They will help the social historian to build up generalizations. Ferrières helps us to understand the plight of the *noblesse de province,* torn between their aristocratic pride and their bourgeois interests, and we may add, their bourgeois culture. He writes, "Je serais fâché que Séraphine [his married daughter] eût deux enfants; c'est assez d'un, et souvent trop" (p. 239), and when this is added to what we have learned of the marquis's business affairs, the problem of depopulation descends from economic statistics to psychological fact. Ferrières, after managing to get some marshes drained in the Saumurois, writes that this will give him more credit among his constituents than all the work of the constitution (p. 132), and we realize that one of the characteristic vices of modern French democracy goes back to its very origins. "Les capitalistes nous amènent insensiblement à tout ce qu'ils veulent", he writes in 1789, with astonishing modernity; "ce sont eux qui font réellement les Etats" (p. 135). Yet these letters are more than a source; they deserve to stand by themselves as a work of art, as the product of the interaction of a well-defined personality and a very special historical environment. The letters are amazingly fresh and real. Perhaps about half the matter contained in them was consciously written to go down to posterity; but not the other half. Some of it is too intimate—the marquis's hemorrhoids, his dislike for his son-in-law, his redeeming a fellow deputy's gold buckle from the Mont-de-Piété, and some of it—the marquis's political judgments, his financial fears—too indiscreet. Ferrières was somewhat a miser, definitely a hypochondriac, and very much a coward. He was also very intelligent. The combination made him an unusually detached observer of the French Revolution. He knew his tenants personally and ran his own farm; his pride of class was never stronger than his common sense. Perhaps there were more like him among the *noblesse de province* than the textbooks have allowed.

The book has a complete index, an interesting preface by the late Professor

Mathiez, and is very fully annotated by Professor Henri Carré. It has an excellent chance of becoming a classic of the Revolution.

Harvard University. CRANE BRINTON.

The Armies of the First French Republic and the Rise of the Marshals of Napoleon I. By the late Colonel RAMSAY WESTON PHIPPS, formerly of the Royal Artillery. Volume III., *The Armies in the West, 1793 to 1797, and the Armies in the South, 1792 to March, 1796.* (Oxford: University Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1931. Pp. xvi, 286. $5.50.)

THIS third volume of the late Colonel Phipps's study of the armies of Revolutionary France may, unfortunately, be the last. Colonel C. F. Phipps, who has edited the manuscripts left by his father, died while the present volume was in press. Such a work owes so much to its editor that the hope of the publishers, that some one may be found to continue the series, may prove difficult of realization.

In this study of the armies in the West and South, Colonel Phipps has clung to the motif of the earlier volumes, the rise of the marshals of Napoleon. Such figures of the empire as Augereau, Sérurier, Victor, Suchet, Bessières, and Lannes appear with detailed personal and military pedigree. Hoche, Grouchy, Kellermann, Masséna, and Berthier reappear to undergo detailed examination. Bonaparte himself receives considerable attention and a rôle of importance is claimed for him at an earlier date than that frequently assigned. It is undoubtedly in this emphasis upon personalities that the charm and much of the value of the book will be found. The analysis of these individuals is both sympathetic and careful and the reader cannot but feel better acquainted with their military characters after he has finished the volume.

He will do well to be content with this and not expect a clear and adequate account of the campaigns. As a history of the war, in the usual sense, Colonel Phipps's study is far from satisfying. In his concentration upon individuals, so much of the general story is either omitted or drastically condensed that the unfamiliar reader can gain but little idea of the general situation. This is especially true of his account of operations in the West. The exception is the campaign of 1795 on the Italian frontier, which is well and adequately described.

In this age of overproduction of footnotes, one at first welcomes the decision of the editor to spare them except where essential. But when it turns out that this means almost an absence of footnotes, even at points where difficult evidence is being handled, relief gives way to a feeling of unsatisfied curiosity occasionally bordering upon skepticism. As so much of Colonel

Phipps's narrative deals with small and controversial points, the inability to follow his evidence is peculiarly disappointing.

Attention must also be called to the point of view of the author. With regard to the French Revolution he has certain prejudices not unexpected in an English officer, although, when upon his favorite topic, the future marshals of Napoleon, he controls this prejudice with a large measure of success. He writes more as a professional soldier than as a historian and devotes considerable attention to features of army life that mean little to the lay student. But this professional slant, if in some ways a shortcoming, does remind the reader of the fact that armies are made up of individuals whose prejudices, peculiarities, and professional ways of thinking and acting determine, as surely as terrain or material, the outcome of a campaign.

Swarthmore College. TROYER S. ANDERSON.

History of Modern Europe: a Survey of the Evolution of European Society from the National Risings against Napoleon to the Present Day. By CHESTER PENN HIGBY, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. [The Century Historical Series.] (New York: Century Company. 1932. Pp. xi, 569. $3.50.)

THE history of Modern Europe has often been told, but there is always scope for another rendering of this fascinating subject. The thing can never be done once and for all; there can be no "definitive" history of Europe. The events and tendencies are so various and manifold that interpretation is necessary. Much new information has come forward since Fyffe wrote his remarkable *History of Europe* in 1880; besides, the perspective of teachers and writers is always changing and ought to change. The developments of the past have to be rejudged according to their effects and continuations in the ever-developing present.

Professor Higby's work as a compendious monograph amply justifies itself, though it goes over well-known ground. It is distinguished by admirable literary presentation, style that is clear and dignified, an absence of straining after effect, a power of judgment that is the result of full knowledge and serious thought. It assumes from the first, and rightly, that there is such a thing as European society, and that the nations of Europe are significant in history because they share in a common civilization rather than because of their individual achievement and value.

The volume begins with a short but illuminating and charmingly written description of western European society before the French Revolution, a society which aimed at "conformity and permanence", but had soon to submit to the great release of forces brought about by the upheaval in France. The period of the Napoleonic Wars is handled with sure touch and great power of compression. Room is found for comments on the characters of the lead-

ing statesmen; this feature, however, is less noticeable throughout the rest of the book, and readers would desire to see more of it. A welcome prominence is given to industrial development, and still more, perhaps, to agricultural. This is an interesting example of the change in perspective (the grand justification for a book like this) necessitated by the march of events; for agricultural development is seen to be now one of the dominating things in Europe's and the world's history, although the books in European history written down to the other day gave almost no attention to it.

The book has been very skillfully organized, compression being rigorously maintained in certain parts so that in others, for instance in regard to the revolutions of 1848, and the Italian and German unity movements, a surprising amount of space has been available. Even so, however, some more space might with advantage have been found for certain later parts of the book; for instance, readers may not feel quite satisfied with the treatment of the immediate causes of the World War; on this subject no explanation is likely to be convincing or informing, unless it is done with considerable fullness and with an extra amount of reference to dates and documents. The military operations in the World War are regarded almost wholly from a European point of view; the achievement of the United States army is scarcely noticed, and the enormous and in many respects decisive moral influence exercised on the European mind by Mr. Wilson in 1917–1918 is overlooked. The considerable amount of space (about seventy pages) devoted to international relations since 1918 is very welcome.

The University of Bristol. R. B. Mowat.

Sir George Otto Trevelyan: a Memoir. By his Son, George Macaulay Trevelyan. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1932. Pp. x, 213. $4.00.)

This volume of modest proportions is an admirable example of the fulfillment of a purpose. In a brief preface the author writes of his father: "Many years ago he told me that he did not wish his Life to be written. Later he said that I could do as I thought fit in the matter. In any case he disliked long biographies, and I have followed what I am sure was his desire in confining the record to a brief and personal memoir." The resulting book illustrates, finally, the distinction between a Memoir and a Life or Biography.

One point of the distinction is that so skillful a memoir as this leaves the reader wishing for more instead, as in the case of so many extended biographies, of wishing for less. The longer book, often owing much of its bulk to copious extracts from letters, is obviously the easier book to write. It calls for an editor's skill in dealing with a mass of material, by means of discrimination between what is of real importance and significance and what is not. The biographer-editor has no small responsibility resting on his

shoulders in this very process of selection. Through his distribution of emphasis, his choice of material on the alternative bases of printing what will throw light upon the personality with which he is concerned, and as he sees it, or what is of primary interest for its illumination of a period or a circle, he holds in his hands the power to make one thing or quite another of his book; and he must realize that from other hands, no less competent than his own, a record of considerable difference in flavor might proceed.

The writer of the briefer memoir has a still more difficult task. He must not only make a familiar acquaintance with all the material; he must even more thoroughly master and assimilate it, and carry the processes of selection and elimination yet further in order to present the essence of the whole matter in terms of his own apprehension.

This is precisely what Mr. Trevelyan has done, and in a manner worthy of all admiration. As the subject of a "full-length" biography, his father must have offered extraordinary temptations. The son's definition of him in the preface from which a quotation has already been made states the case so well that it would be an impertinence to attempt any restatement of it: "He [Sir George Otto Trevelyan] belonged to a type that flourished most in the reign of Queen Victoria, the literary man who was also a politician, the politician and literary man who was also an historian. As a bygone type he may interest those of a different day; as an individual he may interest them even more, for in him we see the classical and literary culture of that age, and the very strong influence of his uncle, working upon a strongly marked personal temperament that was quite his own."

The type has perhaps never been so fully exemplified as in the England of Sir George Otto Trevelyan's long life. The backgrounds of learning—the *dulce* charmingly blended with the *utile*—of society, of politics, of friendship and family life, are those of a ripe civilization, singularly restful and refreshing to contemplate in the strident period now upon us. It is the good fortune of this period, however, that it can claim so accomplished an historian who can prove himself besides so accomplished a biographer—what else is the writer of so revealing a memoir?—as the author of this book.

Boston. M. A. DeWolfe Howe.

Die Letzten Jahrzehnte einer Grossmacht: Menschen, Völker, Probleme des Habsburger-Reichs. Von Rudolf Sieghart. (Berlin: Verlag Ullstein. 1932. Pp. 475. 10 M.)

Long as Herr Sieghart's title is it fails to indicate two important factors: first of all that the book is a memoir, and secondly that it deals almost exclusively with the internal history of Austria. Questions of foreign policy and special Hungarian problems are referred to, but are never dealt with in any detail. While the first half of the book is autobiographical, family or personal

matters are not discussed. The pages are filled with descriptions of Austrian institutions, brilliant characterizations of leading personalities, inner side lights on the activity of Austrian politicians and statesmen.

Herr Sieghart's statements are often source material of the first order, since he was, throughout his political life, on the inside of affairs. In all, he served as adviser to five governmental chiefs, and in 1910 became governor of the important Boden-Credit-Anstalt. About the same time he was appointed to the Herrenhaus. His account of the formation of Koerber's cabinet, his too brief description of the Boden-Credit-Anstalt (which he promises to deal with later in greater detail), the narration of the attempts to settle the language difficulties in Bohemia might be especially singled out.

After the survey of his own career, Herr Sieghart devotes his attention to what he terms *Die Wirkenden Kräfte*. Here he has a favorable essay on Francis Joseph, unfavorable estimates of Francis Ferdinand and Karl I. The nobility, the mass of citizens, the bureaucracy, the Church, the army, and the various political parties are each briefly treated. In a third section he takes up the question of governmental organization, going as far back as the Kremsier Parliament of 1849. The language problem as it related to Bohemia very naturally occupies the center of attention. The long description of proposed settlements, although it shows that the government was attempting to deal with this thorny problem, obscures the situation as it actually existed. A summary of the laws in force in 1914 relating to the use of Czech and German would have been a welcome conclusion to this section.

A critic of Austrian policy in many instances, an opponent of the Ausgleich, Sieghart vehemently protests against the assertion that the Dual Monarchy in 1914 was a state about to fall apart from internal decay. Austria to the end remained a federation of crown lands, and not a federation of nationalities. That the basis of union should have been changed to one more nationalistic Sieghart admits, but points out the great difficulties of doing away with old historical units. After the Industrial Revolution, after the building of railways, after the erection of governmental buildings, it was much harder than in earlier centuries to rearrange governmental areas.

In working out a system for the participation of small racial groups in governmental affairs the Austrian statesmen were exploring a virgin field. By 1914 they had made real progress towards their goal of treating the racial groups not as minorities, but as integral parts of the general governing power. And as Sieghart surveys the policy of the post-war nations of Europe towards their minorities, he concludes that Old Austria would well stand comparison with those nations which have inherited, but have not solved the nationality complex of Central Europe. Yet Sieghart's method, which deals so largely with Austrian national questions as divorced from Hungary, gives a distorted view of the real situation in the Dual Monarchy.

Bowdoin College. E. C. Helmreich.

British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898–1914. Edited by G. P. Gooch, D. Litt., F. B. A., and Harold Temperley, Litt. D., F. B. A., with the Assistance of Lillian M. Penson, Ph. D. Volume VII., *The Agadir Crisis.* (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1932. Pp. lxxii, 917. 17*s.* 6*d.*)

This volume opens with the negotiations which led to the Anglo-French-Spanish exchange of notes on May 16, 1907, for the preservation of the status quo in the Western Mediterranean. The accord was urged by the French, and aimed to prevent Germany from getting cable bases or coaling and naval stations on the Spanish or Moroccan coasts. It had also the further purpose of strengthening Spain in refusing possible German requests for concessions within Spanish territory, of attaching her more firmly to France and England, and of preventing her from seeking other alliances. To the English the agreement was welcome as safeguarding their dominant position at Gibraltar. But Germany took some umbrage at the fact that it had been negotiated without her being informed and because it looked like another step in "encirclement".

The French bombardment of Casablanca, the problem of giving recognition to Mulai Hafid, who had revolted against his brother, Sultan Abdul Aziz, and the complicated squabble over the German deserters at Casablanca, which offered "the sort of problem in international law which examiners would be happy to find to puzzle the candidates whom they were examining" (p. 110), and which was fortunately referred to arbitration, are covered in some eighty pages. The very interesting "Minutes" of Sir Edward Grey and his subordinates occasionally show some annoyance and criticsm at French action in these matters; but the criticism is rather exceptional and is in contrast to the striking intimacy and cordiality with which the foreign office treated the Quai d'Orsay throughout the whole Moroccan situation, which reached its climax in the Agadir affair. One of England's chief efforts was directed toward calming down Spanish indignation toward France. The minutes also betray a persistent distrust of Germany, which was suspected of inciting Mulai Hafid against the French and of intriguing with Spain. The press of all countries unfortunately added fuel to the flame of national hatreds and suspicions. "One is inclined to wish that the English and French press would combine never to mention Germany, though I suppose she would then take offence at that and complain of being boycotted", wrote a British undersecretary. And Sir Edward Grey observed, with King Edward's approval, that "it was very dangerous to play with things of this kind in public, as it was easy for two countries to drift into a position from which neither of them could recede" (p. 119).

The Franco-German agreement of 1909, which virtually abandoned the Algeçiras principle of economic equality for all the powers in Morocco, was

received by the British government with more equanimity than one would suppose. Grey noted: "Politically it is a great advantage that France and Germany should agree not to quarrel about Morocco. Commercially I fear other people must lose by an *entente* between them, though the open door must be preserved on paper" (p. 135; *cf.* however, pp. 179, 186). This equanimity, if as complete as these documents would lead one to believe, is doubtless to be explained by Grey's distrust of Germany's intentions and by his consequent solicitude for the Anglo-French Entente.

The French March to Fez in 1911 again aroused great indignation in Spain, and led, contrary to English advice, to the Spanish occupation of Larache and Alcazar. The English were convinced that the Germans had incited Spain to this action in order to make trouble between France and Spain and to give color to the new German thesis that the Act of Algeçiras had broken down, thus restoring to Germany her freedom of action and giving her a further excuse for sending the *Panther* to Agadir.

The protracted diplomatic crisis which resulted from this sudden German step fills nearly four hundred large pages. In a brief review it is impossible to give any summary of it. It may merely be noted that the French minister of foreign affairs, De Selves, kept the British cabinet very fully informed of every step in the Cambon-Kiderlen negotiations for "compensations". But there is almost nothing about the parallel negotiations which Caillaux, the French premier, carried on through Fondère with the German embassy in Paris without the full knowledge either of Cambon in Berlin or of De Selves in Paris, the discovery of which later led to Caillaux's downfall. There are hints, however, that Cambon wished to go much further in meeting German wishes than De Selves's instructions would permit. To Goschen, the British ambassador in Berlin, he complained that "he was hampered at every step. . . . They do not seem to realize in Paris the *enormous* advantage of a free hand in Morocco—nor the fact that in order to get what they want they must pay *handsomely* for it. . . . He considers it in fact idiotic to hesitate about making a really big sacrifice in the Congo in view of the paramount importance to France of 'une action directrice' in Morocco. 'In my own personal opinion', he added, 'that is worth the whole of the French Congo!' " (p. 499; *cf.* also pp. 532, 545, 563). Cambon even asked Goschen to get Grey to put pressure on De Selves to yield more to Germany. But Grey replied, "I daren't press the French more about the Congo. If I do so we may eventually get the odium in France for an unpopular concession and the whole Entente may go . . . though I agree with Jules Cambon that Morocco in fee simple would be worth all the French Congo" (p. 546).

The newspapers of France, Germany, and England greatly aggravated and envenomed the Agadir Crisis. Kiderlen had stipulated with Cambon at the beginning of the negotiations that they should be kept absolutely secret.

But to his indignation he found that some of his proposals to Cambon were reproduced at once almost word for word in Paris journals. These "leaks" excited the French chauvinists and German nationalists against each other and against their own governments, thus making it almost impossible to reach a satisfactory compromise agreement on French cessions of territory in the Congo in return for German abandonment of claims in Morocco. Kiderlen complained many times to Goschen and to Cambon of the embarrassment which these "leaks" caused him. He even threatened to break off the negotiations because of them. But Cambon was evidently not to blame, for Goschen reported that his French colleague "is furious with his Government for their indiscretions, which he considers have ruined all the chance he had of making an acceptable settlement. These indiscretions, he maintains, were not made by De Selves, but by one of his underlings who hates him [Cambon] and would stick at nothing to do him a bad turn" (p. 413).

Likewise, after Lloyd George's Mansion House speech, the French and British press played it up in such a way that Kiderlen found it impossible to make concessions to Cambon without seeming to back down before English threats and so suffer a loss of prestige. It was not so much what Lloyd George said as the way the newspapers commented on it that galled the German foreign office and caused the Agadir Crisis to arouse almost more bitterness between Germany and England than between Germany and France. Fortunately, Mr. Gooch and Professor Temperley have given, as in earlier volumes, generous extracts from dispatches commenting on or summarizing these baneful press feuds.

One piquant and little-known incident is Kiderlen's successful effort in preventing a meeting of the British and German navies in Norwegian waters during the height of the crisis just after Lloyd George's speech. "You know the Emperor pretty well", he said to Goschen, "and you can imagine how excited he will be at the sight of the two Squadrons. He will certainly want to make the most of the opportunity, and there is every chance that, as Admiral of both Navies, he will amuse Himself by putting Himself at the head of the combined Squadrons and going through a series of Naval Manoeuvres—ending in a great Banquet, Toasts and God knows what." So he begged Goschen to delay the British fleet by a timely fog, or shooting off some ammunition, or by some other means known to sailors. "Of course if it ever came out that he had acted as he was now doing he would be dismissed from his office at once" (pp. 622 ff.). Accordingly the British cancelled their cruise to Norway.

In contrast to the lack of harmony between Caillaux, De Selves, and Cambon, and to the differences between Kiderlen and the Kaiser, is the almost perfect accord between Sir Edward Grey and his officials in London and his ambassadors abroad. Bertie at Paris, Goschen at Berlin, and Bunsen

at Madrid all give the impression of doing exactly what Grey wanted and of acting with tact, firmness, and good sense—qualities however for which Sir Fairfax Cartwright at Vienna was not so distinguished.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

The Origin and Development of the State Cult of Confucius: an Introductory Study. By JOHN K. SHRYOCK, Ph. D. [Published for the American Historical Association.] (New York: Century Company. 1932. Pp. xiii, 298. $4.00.)

CONSIDERING the preponderating influence of Confucius in Chinese culture the appearance of such a study as this is long overdue. That the "uncrowned king" of China has for centuries been the recipient of state sacrifices and of progressively exalted titles is common knowledge. But here for the first time in a Western language is unrolled the story and significance of the whole procedure in a most readable volume. It is the more illuminating because Dr. Shryock seeks to place the cult in its total social setting and function. The method is admirable, considering the limitations under which Westerners must work in the field of Chinese history. His basic sources are Chinese—imperial edicts and scattered references to the cult in the long array of dynastic records. Around these with the aid of secondary sources he has reconstructed the successive historical situations in which cult developments and practices have gone on. The result is a clear indication that the worship of Confucius is a phenomenon of the emergence into state power of a particular social group. "He was the patron of scholars, and came to receive worship from the state because the state was interested in the creation and maintenance of the scholar class and because it used that class almost exclusively in its administrative system. . . . The close association of an educational system directed and fostered by the state with the actual administration of the government was the real cause of the growth of the cult" (p. 224). The religious character of the cult is found to arise in the Han dynasty when, no longer a simple case of ancestor worship within the family of Confucius, it became a "hero-worship deliberately adopted by the state at the instance of a social group, the scholars"—a worship which assimilates to itself features from the ancient cults of nature gods and ancestors. Thereafter the fortunes of the cult of Confucius vary with the fortunes and characteristics of the scholar class under successive dynasties.

In these pages an exacting task has been well discharged. Annotations at the end of chapters and the appended bibliographies of works in European and Far Eastern languages testify to a wide range of reading and familiarity with many debatable problems. Yet the text itself reads straight forward and the reader is not confused by the erudition which supports it. Special information concerning tablet inscriptions in Confucian temples and certain

Chinese texts on the beginnings of the cult are given in appendixes. The sketches of the dynastic periods contain many interesting details. Necessarily too brief to be regarded as complete characterizations of the several epochs, they are adequate for illuminating the cult and introducing the reader into the vast background of China's continuing culture.

Dr. Shryock recognizes that special students may wish to make some changes in particular statements within their fields. That may be done without altering the total impression which the material assembled is meant to convey. In particular the reviewer does not regard the reference on page 183 to "similarities" between Wang Shou-jen and Vasubandhu as altogether happy in connection with the question as to Buddhistic influence on the former. It is true that this Chinese Confucian and the Indian Buddhist philosopher happen both to be idealists, but that is about all we can say for resemblance. The elaboration of their systems is so diverse that comparison is of little worth. Buddhistic influence on Sung-Yüan-Ming Confucianism is an undoubted fact but its precise character remains yet to be discerned, as the author himself has observed on an earlier page (pp. 149 f.) in referring to the philosophers of the Sung dynasty. The point, however, is a minor one. The book as a whole is remarkably effective in ordering and condensing a very wide range of important material for our understanding of Confucianism.

Oberlin College. CLARENCE H. HAMILTON.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by DUMAS MALONE. Volume VIII., Grinnell-Hibbard; volume IX., Hibben-Jarvis. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1932. Pp. ix, 612; x, 625. $250 for the complete set.)

THE latest installments of the *Dictionary of American Biography* continue to add abundantly to our knowledge of the richness and variety of the human forces that have helped build American civilization. The 662 sketches of the eighth volume and the 674 of the ninth bring the grand total to 6122. If fame can be measured by the number of memoirs, the Halls rank first with 37, followed by the Jacksons, 32; the Harrises, 31; the Hills, 24; the Howes and Hunts, 21 each; and the Harrisons, 20. Yet many readers will find greater interest in the James brothers, whether Henry and William or Jesse and Frank, than in any of these. It is worth noting that the present volumes represent a higher degree of collaboration than any of the earlier ones, 324 individuals contributing to the eighth and 362 to the ninth.

From the banquet spread before the reader it is difficult to select the viands of particular succulence. The preferred list, however, would un-

doubtedly include A. C. Cole's "Marcus Alonzo Hanna", Allan Nevins's "Warren Gamaliel Harding"—singularly candid—R. E. Cushman's "John Marshall Harlan", Paul Shorey's "William Rainey Harper", E. S. Bates's "William Torrey Harris", Carl Van Doren's "Nathaniel Hawthorne" and "Henry James", M. A. DeW. Howe's "Oliver Wendell Holmes", Ferdinand Schevill's "Hermann Eduard von Holst", W. H. Hamilton's "Robert Franklin Hoxie", Stuart Daggett's "Collis Potter Huntington", C. L. Becker's "Thomas Hutchinson", W. H. Downes's "George Inness", and R. B. Perry's "William James". The brief memoirs of certain other figures suggest the crying need for extended treatments hitherto lacking. In this category fall John P. Hale, Wade Hampton (1818–1902), David B. Hill, Isaac Hill, Josiah G. Holland, Elias Howe, R. M. Hunt, John Ireland (1838–1918), and Helen Hunt Jackson. Doctoral candidates please take notice!

Among the sketches which were looked for in vain were those of John H. Griscom (1809–1874), physician and humanitarian; Francis J. Grund (d. 1863), author and publicist; Charles J. Guiteau (1842–1881), assassin of Garfield; Thomas B. Gunning (1814–1889), inventor of dental and surgical apparatus; George R. Halm (1850–1899), engraver and artist; Harlan P. Halsey (1837–1898), member of the New York City board of education and author of the "Old Sleuth" series of dime novels; John B. Hamilton (1847–1898), surgeon; Orlando Harley (1856–1901), grand-opera tenor; William H. Harnett (1850–1892), painter; Maud Haslam (Groome) (1869–1899), actress; Alice Hastings (1856–1888), actress; Horace L. Hastings (1831–1899), hymnologist and author of the *Anti-Infidel Library;* John H. W. Hawkins (1797–1858), temperance reformer; Edward S. Hayden (1852–1899), discoverer of the "Hayden process" in the working of precious metals; John W. Hendley (1827–1899), wax modeler; Holmes Hinkley (d. 1866), pioneer locomotive builder; Richard J. Hinton (1830–1901), Union spy and specialist in labor matters; Thomas M. Hogan (1842–1890), illustrator; James Holbrook (d. 1864), government detective; Martin L. Holbrook (1831–1902), hygienist; Albert Hopkins (1807–1872), astronomer; Eben N. Hosford (1818–1893), experimental chemist; Ellen C. Howarth (1827–1899), poet; Charles S. Hoyt (1822–1898), physician and philanthropist; Frederic Hudson (1819–1875), historian of American journalism; Thaddeus Hyatt (1816–1901), abolitionist and inventor; and Martin Irons (1832–1900), labor organizer. By some curious lapse, the career and achievements of Thomas Hicks, the portrait painter, are attributed to John Hicks (IX. 7).

For the most part, misstatements of fact are neither frequent nor important. It is erroneous, though commonly asserted, that President Harding's papers were destroyed (VIII. 257). "Cleveland's restoration of monarchy" in Hawaii (IX. 81) never got beyond the stage of recommendation. It is incorrect, or at least misleading, to assert that the Lyceum movement sur-

vived the Civil War (IX. 130). The value of sulphuric ether as an anæsthetic was discovered in Boston not by J. C. Warren (as stated in IX. 239), but by W. T. G. Morton (as stated in the same volume, page 539). Senator T. O. Howe voted for the conviction, not the "impeachment" (IX. 298), of President Johnson. The assertion that Helper's *Impending Crisis* created a sensation "far greater than *Uncle Tom's Cabin*" (VIII. 517) is dubious.

As for more general criticisms, the account of G. W. Guthrie's ambassadorship to Japan (IX. 60) is so highly generalized as to leave one nearly as much in the dark as before reading the memoir. The sketches of E. H. Harriman and H. O. Havemeyer are marred by too many reticences. The account of W. D. Howells is hardly more than an annotated bibliography. The man himself remains shadowy, his courageous stand at the time of the Haymarket riot goes unnoticed, and his importance as an encourager of younger writers is slighted. One wonders, too, at the unnecessary perpetuation of romantic notions of biological inheritance: "An English great-grandmother sobered the Welsh ferment; an Irish grandfather (mother's father) aerated the Teutonic phlegm", and more to the same effect (IX. 306). Of major political biographies, that of Andrew Jackson falls short of the average maintained by these and earlier volumes. Though this is largely a matter of the author's general conception of this stormy petrel of American politics, errors of fact also appear. It is more rhetorical than accurate to say that Jackson's victory at New Orleans "created a president" and "a party" (IX. 529). It belies the spirit of Jackson's own words in his first message to Congress to assert that his introduction of the spoils system was actuated by "no abstract principle of equal rights" (p. 532). It is equally contrary to the record to affirm that he did not base the Maysville Road veto "on strict-constructionist grounds" (p. 533). It is not true that the United States Bank was "dead" (p. 533) when the government deposits were withdrawn. And what would Calhoun, then coöperating with the Whigs, have said to the author's contention that that chaotic party was committed to "Clay's nationalist policy" (p. 534)?

Harvard University. ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER.

The Susquehannah Company Papers. Edited by JULIAN P. BOYD. Volume I., 1750–1755; volume II., 1756–1767; volume III., 1768–1769. [Sheldon Reynolds Memorial Publications.] (Wilkes-Barré: Wyoming Historical and Geological Society. 1930, 1931. Pp. xc, 363; xlii, 354; xxxiii, 354. $5.00 each.)

THE Wyoming Historical and Geological Society is to be congratulated on the importance of the contribution it is making to the history of the American frontier in its present undertaking. For an examination of the first three volumes of *The Susquehannah Company Papers,* published under the editor-

ship of Dr. Boyd, indicates that these are much more comprehensive than the title of the series might suggest. They include not only the minutes and other official papers of the company down to the year 1770, but also numerous letters written by those not connected with its activities, extracts from newspapers, memorials, petitions, resolutions, legal opinions, depositions, proclamations, and warrants, all arranged chronologically, together with the most important pamphlet literature relating to the controversy that develops between the two groups of land claimants in northern Pennsylvania, rare maps, and other contemporary illustrative material. Further, the documents printed in each of the three volumes are preceded by illuminating introductions which serve to interpret the more significant aspects of this notable episode in our late colonial and early national history. The two colonies involved are held up for contrast to the disadvantage of Pennsylvania, at least with respect to such matters as homogeneity of population, orderly operation of government, progress in education, and preparation for defense. However, the statement that one of the chief explanations for the large-scale land speculations carried on by Pennsylvania capitalists was the restraining effect of the policy of Great Britain that "prevented them from investing their capital in manufacturing", may well be questioned in light of the fact that by 1750, the year of the Iron Act, Pennsylvania had established her leadership in American iron production and her wealthy ironmasters continued to develop this industry without giving much heed to imperial restrictions.

This conflict between the proprietors of Pennsylvania and the Susquehannah Company is well characterized as at basis a struggle between two systems of landholding, quitrent and allodial. But, in light of the bitter contest that took place along the New York-Massachusetts Bay border in the middle of the eighteenth century, involving the great Livingston Manor, one is hardly justified in calling the former the one outstanding conflict between the two systems, granted that it was by far the most important. Nor is it easy to accept the statement that in view of the general interest manifested at this critical period in westward expansion the members of the Susquehannah Company felt that in laying their plans to set up in northern Pennsylvania, by force if need be, a corporate colony patterned after Connecticut, in disregard of an express grant to William Penn and his successors hitherto not questioned by Connecticut authorities, "they were performing something that would meet with the approval of the Crown". The antagonistic attitude of the board of trade toward the charters of the surviving corporate establishments in America, not to take into account the favorable sentiments held by the royal authority toward the Pennsylvania proprietors at this juncture, could hardly have escaped any but these deluded and land-hungry men. However, the evasive attitude assumed by the Connecticut governors

in communicating with the Pennsylvania authorities, especially the amazing effrontery of Governor Fitch in disclaiming in a letter written in the latter part of 1754 any knowledge of the Susquehannah Company scheme or of the persons connected with it, in spite of the fact that its activities had been a chief topic of discussion in Connecticut for over a year and his own son was a leader in this organization, is well presented and does no injustice to the good governor.

The volumes under review are attractively printed and bound and evidence much painstaking in their preparation. Only a few errors have been noticed by the reviewer.

Lehigh University. LAWRENCE H. GIPSON.

Gilbert Stuart. By WILLIAM T. WHITLEY. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1932. Pp. xiv, 240. $5.00.)

HOUDON, the finest sculptor of his times, and Gilbert Stuart, in the first rank of American portrait painters, have depicted George Washington at once so truly and so nobly as to satisfy both artists and the general public during succeeding generations. How much Washington's fame is due to these two artists is an interesting subject of speculation.

William T. Whitley's *Gilbert Stuart* is much more than a treatise on an artist; it is a record of the part played by the fine arts as representative of the culture of earliest days of the republic. The first six Presidents, Washington, John and John Quincy Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, as well as General Knox, John Jay, Daniel Webster, and a host of less enduring personages, found Stuart a true interpreter of their character as expressed in their features. The records of the circumstances attending the painting of the portraits are valuable footnotes to the history of the times.

Gilbert Stuart was born at Narragansett, Rhode Island, in a house recently restored as a memorial of him. His father came from Edinburgh to build and run a snuff mill. The enterprise having failed, the family removed to Newport, where Stuart attended the grammar school founded by Bishop Berkeley, the friend of Smibert, first trained painter in America. Stuart's first master was Cosino Hamilton, who took his young pupil with him to Edinburgh, where he won some recognition. After a brief visit to Newport, Stuart went, about 1775, to London, and a year or so later was assisted by his fellow countryman, Sir Benjamin West, then on the crest of the British art wave. By 1787 Stuart's popularity was greater than that of any London painter except Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Romney. For several years he had been making money very fast and spending it much faster on extravagant entertainment. At the height of his career, he disappeared from London and turned up in Dublin, where he repeated both his artistic success and his extravagance. In 1793 Stuart landed in New York, where he immediately

found sitters, Aaron Burr among them. His ambition and determination were to paint Washington; and this he did first in 1795, but was dissatisfied with the result and soon destroyed the canvas. The next year, Washington, weary to death of sitting to artists, reluctantly was persuaded by William Bingham, the richest man in Philadelphia, to sit to Stuart for a full-length portrait to be given by Bingham to Lord Lansdowne. Mrs. Stuart describes Washington on his first appearance at the studio as "the most superb person I had ever seen. He was dressed in black velvet with white lace ruffles, exactly as Stuart's picture represents him." After Lord Lansdowne's death in 1805, the portrait was sold at auction in London for about $27,000 a higher price than ever was paid for a portrait by an English artist. From this original Stuart made several copies, one for Gardner Baker, who publicly exhibited it and then sold it to one Laing. Laing gave it to the White House and entrusted it to an artist named Winstanley to pack and ship to Washington. Winstanley made a copy of the portrait and disposed of the Stuart copy. The change was not discovered until Stuart, happening to be at the White House, saw what had been shown (and still is) as an example of his work. This is the portrait Dolly Madison saved in 1814.

The second original Stuart Washington is the one owned by the Boston Athenæum, which was officially used by the Bicentennial Commission. Mrs. Washington coaxed her husband to sit for the portrait for her own gratification; but Stuart never would finish the picture, because he desired to keep it to make the many copies which came from his brush. In 1831, the Athenæum bought from Stuart's daughter for $1500 the portraits of General and Mrs. Washington. Stuart also painted two of Mrs. Washington's granddaughters, Eliza and Nelly Custis.

Stuart had the knack of interesting his sitters by his conversation so as to make them reveal themselves to his practiced eye. John Adams, painted at eighty-nine, said, "I should like to sit to Stuart from January first to December thirty-first, for he lets me do just what I please and keeps me constantly amused by his conversation". And yet, six years before, John Adams had expressed the hope that the age of painting and sculpture would not arrive in this country very soon, and had declared that he "would not give sixpence for a picture of Raphael or a statue of Phidias".

Mr. Whitley has supplemented the meager correspondence of Stuart with industriously gathered printed accounts of the painter's work in London, Dublin, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and Boston, in which latter city he died in 1828. Also the author has gone through the great mass of biographical material, using the work of others and making many corrections as the result of his researches. All this he has done in the leisurely style characteristic of English historians, and also with their usual freedom from acrimony and their desire to state the truth so far as ascertained, with no pre-

conceived conclusions to maintain. He has made an interesting as well as a valuable book.

Washington, D. C. CHARLES MOORE.

The Biography of a College, being the History of the First Century of the Life of Lafayette College. By DAVID BISHOP-SKILLMAN. Two volumes. (Easton: Lafayette College. 1932. Pp. xv, 401; x, 393. $10.00.)

MANY excellencies of these two well-made volumes are evident. The work is properly named. It is a biography of the college: it is a biography of the college not only because of the fact itself but also because it is largely made up of biographies of its founders and supporters for the whole century period. Of course, its scholastic and somewhat unique records are presented —such as the early training for teachers, a systematic four-year course in the Bible, the teaching of English under the great March, and the combined curriculum in the classics and in the sciences. But the interpretations of these pioneering facts are made less significant than are the lives of the trustees, of the teachers, and of the graduates. Indeed, the author says: "In writing this life made up of many lives, the temptation and desire has been to tell much of the men who have had a part in making Lafayette, and also to tell of the notable services and achievements of the thousands of men who, for a portion of their lives, have been part and parcel of the college" (preface, p. vii). Though declaring that he has not gratified this desire, yet the author has yielded more fully to it than he thinks. He has thus in a sense continued the content of *The Men of Lafayette: Lafayette College, its History, its Men, their Record,* published in 1891.

Among the outstanding men whose lives have richly contributed to *The Biography of a College* are Francis A. March, sr., a scholar and a teacher, eminent in the whole world of scholarship, and, in the later period, three presidents—William C. Cattell, Ethelbert D. Warfield, and John Henry MacCracken. These presidencies have indeed been among the constructive presidencies of American colleges.

Rich, therefore, are the biographical details of this history. Yet it is defective in failing to present this historic college as an essential element of general educational history. For it does not interpret Lafayette as an integral part of the process and movement of the higher education. Pennsylvania is among the states well endowed with colleges and universities. Of them are found no less than thirty. Among them are historic universities and new colleges, diverse in origin, in environment, and in development. The University of Pennsylvania is easily the leader of all. Foundations laid by the Friends (of two faiths), by the Presbyterian, and the Reformed, by the Methodist, Baptist, and Lutheran churches, and by the Roman Catholic Church, in large cities

and in small villages, by Germans and by English, early and recent, in western Pennsylvania as well as in eastern, form a part of the history of higher education in Pennsylvania and in the United States. Of this general movement Lafayette was and is really an integral part. But Lafayette's share receives scant presentation and interpretation. These volumes are rich in their dealing with great personalities; they neglect to interpret educational and institutional relationships.

Western Reserve University. CHARLES F. THWING.

The Mission to Spain of Pierre Soulé, 1853–1855: a Study in the Cuban Diplomacy of the United States. By AMOS ASCHBACH ETTINGER, Sometime Instructor in History, Yale University, Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, London. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1932. Pp. xi, 559. $4.00.)

THE Cuban diplomacy of the United States may be divided into two parts, that which preceded our Civil War, and that which has followed it. Such a division is by no means to be confined to our Cuban diplomacy; but this is a subject which limitations of space forbid me now to discuss, as it would involve a consideration of the associations, professions, and shibboleths by which certain underlying and persistent tendencies may at present be disguised. It is, however, a fact that, as regards our diplomacy prior to the Civil War, Soulé's brief diplomatic adventure at Madrid, although it has a strong personal flavor, most vividly illustrates certain pre-war trends of our diplomacy, and of contemporaneous European diplomacy as related to American diplomacy.

It is for this reason that the present work, which embraces the results of an intelligent, indefatigable, exhaustive examination of both European and American sources, official and unofficial, published and unpublished, has, as an illuminant, an importance wider than its titular description would convey. A Frenchman transplanted by chance to the United States by way of Haiti, where he was suddenly and radically converted to the view that the Negro race was outside the conception of human liberty which he had before so valiantly championed, Soulé found in Louisiana a congenial atmosphere and full opportunity for the display of his exceptional gifts. As an immigrant without pecuniary means, he naturally had at first a hard struggle; but he was one of those aggressive and restless personalities who, wherever they go, inevitably figure in sensations, gaining friends and making enemies, but on the whole winning popularity as one of the resounding players in the drama of the day. With these qualities he fought his way to the top; and in the space of eight years, from 1847 to 1855, was twice elected to the United States Senate, and achieved at Madrid, as minister and duelist, a career unexampled in the diplomacy of the United States.

Soulé's appointment to Madrid Dr. Ettinger correctly attributes, as I

think, to the expansionists who wanted Cuba, among whom Caleb Cushing influentially figured, and the "Young America" group, who demanded diplomatic appointments as a solace for the loss of cabinet positions. In reality, Dr. Ettinger, following Schouler, says "slave-holding" expansionists; but I cannot unreservedly accept this limitation. No slaveholder ever sang the beneficent effects of the expansion of the United States over "vast regions" to the south and the west, including the "purchased conquests", as the Supreme Court called them, of Mexican territory in 1848, with a sweeter or more sonorous eloquence than did the conservative Whig, Edward Everett, in declining in 1852 the invitation to the United States to sign the self-denying tripartite treaty. At an earlier day John Jay, an antislavery man, sang in similar strain the past performances and future prospects of "our western sons of liberty". Twenty years ago, in my *Four Phases of American Development,* I ventured (p. 174) the opinion that, but for the controversy concerning slavery, there would have been no appreciable opposition in the United States to the acquisition of Texas or of California and New Mexico, the general sentiment in favor of continental expansion being sufficient, as it was in the case of Louisiana, to overwhelm any local antagonism to the disturbance of the balance of power in the Union. The late Judge Gresham, antislavery man and Union soldier, who had a brother in the Mexican War, more than once remarked to me that the war spirit swept down the valley of the Ohio like a fire across the prairies. Lincoln suffered a political eclipse in Illinois because of his criticisms of the war, although he voted for the appropriations to carry it on. Von Holst has familiarized us with "slavocracy" and "slavocrats" as forces in our constitutional development; but, while they undoubtedly bore a definite relation to the Civil War, which hung on constitutional questions, they only shared, with some objective distortion, the expansionist spirit that accounts for modern as well as for ancient empires; the spirit that, for instance, impelled France, during the Civil War in the United States, to endeavor to subjugate Mexico. Perhaps one may, in the light of that significant episode, conjecture that the Monroe Doctrine, though now and then perverted, has tended to limit the disturbance of the peace of the western hemisphere.

Of the conduct of William L. Marcy, Pierce's Secretary of State, in the matter of the dismissal of Horatio J. Perry, secretary of the legation at Madrid, Dr. Ettinger takes a very unfavorable view, intimating, as I understand him, that Marcy's plea that the private exhibition of Perry's confidential letters was due to a "leak" elsewhere than in the Department of State was not well founded. But, even though my interpretation on this point may be wrong, I may say that there was such a "leak". On investigating this question forty years ago I learned from the late Dr. James C. Welling, the last editor of the *National Intelligencer,* and, at the time of the Soulé mission, assistant editor

of that journal, that the disclosure was made through Perry's personal friend, Severn Teackle Wallis, a member of the Baltimore bar and author of two works on Spain, published in 1850 and 1853, to whom Perry, apprehensive lest his letter to Pierce, which duly appeared in the *National Intelligencer,* might lead to his sudden dismissal, sent copies of the confidential papers to be used, publicly or privately, in his justification. It was done privately, but unsuccessfully. What Dr. Welling told me was afterwards confirmed by Mr. Wallis himself, who, indeed, gave me the papers!

On certain questions, including that of the extension of slavery, Marcy was more than suspected by dominant members of his party. Treading warily, he was sometimes obliged to subordinate strong personal sentiments to broad considerations of the general interest, as he did by remaining in office after Pierce, against his earnest remonstrance, recognized the Rivas-Walker government in Nicaragua. Cabinet members, as the final decision rests with the President, are peculiarly exposed to such a predicament. They must also consider the attitude of the Senate and of senators. Surveying Marcy's unusual record of varied and important achievements, we may feel thankful that, while quietly puncturing the Ostend Manifesto, peacefully adjusting disputes with Spain, and otherwise out-maneuvering his enemies, he avoided a final breach with his chief.

New York. JOHN BASSETT MOORE.

South Carolina during Reconstruction. By FRANCIS BUTLER SIMKINS, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, State Teachers College, Farmville, Virginia, and ROBERT HILLIARD WOODY, Instructor in History, Duke University. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1932. Pp. xiv, 610. $8.00.)

WITH refreshing freedom from prejudice and special pleading, the authors picture honest, unselfish carpetbaggers, respectable, well-meaning scalawags, and Negroes with intelligence and political ability. They count as many white Democrats under Federal indictment for violence in elections as Republicans guilty of corruption. General Canby is here no military tyrant but a man "of enlarged liberality" solicitous of "the public welfare". Republican Governor Chamberlain is honest and courageous. On the other hand, the authors describe ex-slaveholders like Hampton willing to extend suffrage to intelligent Negroes, ex-Confederates coöperating cheerfully with Northern commanders, and ex-secessionists accepting the verdict of the War. In short, one finds honest, public-spirited men, and unscrupulous self-seekers in all groups. Slavery had left the Negro childlike and ignorant, the non-planter white uneducated and politically inexperienceed, and the cultivated aristocracy adept at managing slaves and ruling commonwealths but unused to democracy and manual labor. Reconstruction tells the story of their mutual

efforts to adjust themselves to revolutionized conditions of life, to build new political institutions, a new economic system, and even a new social order. The problem was complicated by the influx of outsiders and the temporary domination of the unscrupulous of all groups which chaotic post-war conditions made possible.

Political narrative is only one phase of Reconstruction. The authors describe the manifold problems of transition from plantations to small farms, experiments with hired labor, tenant-farming, crop-sharing, efforts at diversification and scientific method in agriculture; the rebuilding of transportation facilities; attempts to develop manufactures; the revival of commerce; the restoration of towns; and the difficulties of financing this rehabilitation of the state. The struggle of aristocrats to retain privileges and maintain the forms of the old life amidst poverty and decay, the rise of poorer whites, the development of recently seceded religious denominations, the establishment of separate Negro churches, the development of Negro and white schools, interferences of Northerners in these matters—all are portrayed. The Negro is treated not only as a political problem, but as a social, economic, pedagogic, and religious factor. In conclusion the authors show the unfortunate influence of the ordeal of Reconstruction upon the Southern mind of to-day.

Despite remarkable objectivity, the book reveals an underlying philosophy of the propertied white. The authors seem to disapprove Tillman's suffrage reforms of 1895 as much because "the Negro had already learned of the inconveniences and dangers of politics" as because they were "subterfuges". Their proof of the "irresponsible character" of the 1868 convention because its members were not large property holders or taxpayers rests upon the assumption that wealth gives rights and good government. In declaring that white Radicals "deserve *more* condemnation than the Negroes" they imply culpability of Negroes for participating in government. They criticize "stinging declarations against slavery" as inconsiderate of "injured feelings" of whites without remarking Negro injuries under slavery. They believe, "The literary instruction imparted [apparently merely reading and writing] elevated the [Negro] race into an unreal world and left it less adequately equipped for the problem of living than did the industrial training given the plantation slave." Nowhere is the possibility of social equality for cultivated Negroes seriously considered. Historians usually do write from a particular point of view, but it should be avowed.

Other questions arise. One wonders if the killing of twenty-three per cent. of "the arms-bearing population" really explains "the lack of distinctive achievements of South Carolinians since the war". Figures that show South Carolina farms much more profitable than Illinois farms in 1873 and than the nation's average farm in 1880 are startling. Did declining prices in cotton really injure foreign competitors more than domestic producers? In

view of slaveholders' motives for encouraging Negro religion under white control and prohibiting it under Negro preachers, one questions the master class's "great solicitude" for the Negroes' "spiritual welfare". Use of authorities is sometimes uncritical. For instance, the assertion that "scheming state officials gave a star of the burlesque stage a percentage commission to induce the drunken governor to sign an issue of bonds" is based upon one man's memory of an anecdote told forty-five years before by a disreputable politician under circumstances where the telling might secure favor. Occasional contradictions occur: for example, in the 1868 convention "injured feelings of the . . . white minority were not considered" and one page later "there was even an inclination to respect the feelings of 'the brave men' who had been defeated"; again, "The assumption of the equality of all men before the law has usually been flaunted whenever the issue of white supremacy has been involved", and later, "The principle of the equality of all men before the law was . . . grafted into the judicial practice . . . and it has not since been extirpated". One would like some explanation of unwillingness to grant political, social, and cultural privileges to capable Negroes; more of the realities of decaying aristocracy and less of its romantic attempts to maintain ante bellum social customs; and, finally, light on the relative importance of Southern ante bellum policies, inevitable effects of war, and Northern interference, in creating the hardships of Reconstruction. Failure to consult a single manuscript is amazing. And the bibliography is completely uncritical.

On the whole, however, the book stands a model for rewriting Reconstruction history. It is fair; it is thorough. It is long, but—except for the chapter on railroads where one flounders in statistics not clearly set forth—interesting. The style is good. Constant quotation from contemporaries creates a vivid picture. Sympathetic understanding makes clear the manifold problems which each group faced. One closes the book with a new perception of the social, economic, and cultural factors which created the New South of to-day.

Washington, D. C. HOWARD K. BEALE.

The Populist Revolt: a History of the Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party. By JOHN D. HICKS, Professor of American History and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Nebraska. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1931. Pp. xiii, 473. $4.00.)

IN the era when Mrs. Lease urged farmers "to raise less corn and more hell" the agrarian movement was enveloped in the smoke of battle and the mists of prejudice. Time has cleared the air, and Dr. Hicks is able not only to see outlines that were blurred to contemporary eyes, but also to view the scene with urbanity and impartiality. For more than a decade he has delved

in the contemporary records of the Farmers' Alliance and Populism, including the Donnelly, Weller, Allen, and Maxwell manuscripts. He has taken scholarly advantage of his academic peregrinations from Minnesota to North Carolina and to Nebraska, bringing out many preliminary studies dealing with segments of the movement; and he has mastered the abundant secondary literature that the field, much cultivated in recent years, has yielded. The time was ripe for a synthesis built up from the author's own research and from the numerous local and regional studies now available. Surveys of Populism, it is true, were included in Haynes's *Third Party Movements since the Civil War* (1916) and Buck's *Agrarian Crusade* (1920), but not since McVey's *Populist Movement* (1896) had there been a comprehensive treatment of the subject.

Dr. Hicks has performed a notable service to American historical scholarship in writing this interesting and valuable book. He opens with an analysis of the grievances that the farmers suffered, or "thought they suffered", from railroads, trusts, middlemen, money-lenders, and from a muddled currency, but he sees the larger background of the agrarian crusade in the turning of the frontier upon itself after the passing of free lands. The westward movement in its last period, under railway leadership, was a headlong rush, with population streaming in so rapidly that "thoughtful and deliberate readjustments" could not be made. Soon the safety valve of the frontier was gone; and when the boom collapsed, "the restless and discontented voiced their sentiments more and fled from them less". The agrarian movements were "but the inevitable attempts of a bewildered people to find relief from a state of economic distress made certain by the unprecedented size and suddenness of their assault upon the west and by the finality with which they had conquered it". In the South a complication of conditions prepared the rural whites for revolt, given "hard enough times and a sufficiently active group of agitators". Against such a background the author pictures the organization of the farmers after the period of the Grangers and describes the progress of the movement through the eighties and nineties. He traces carefully the rise of the Farmers' Alliance; portrays Alliance Activities in a chapter that might perhaps have devoted more space to coöperative enterprises; sketches the swing from a nonpartisan basis to political action; analyzes the subtreasury plan; describes the birth of the People's party; discusses the election of 1892; pictures the Populists on Trial in the West; gives an account of the rise of the silver issue; recounts the dramatic story of The Triumph of Fusion; then follows the Middle-of-the-Road Populists to the end of the trail; and finally assesses the Populist contribution.

The contribution of Populism, as Dr. Hicks views it, consisted largely in paving the way for reforms that, though rejected at the time, ultimately were achieved. These reforms, particularly in the fields of political democracy,

currency and credit, railroad and trust control, and conservation, the author discusses in some detail, pointing out that the Populist panaceas were based upon an individualistic philosophy and found general expression in the two-fold creed that government must restrain the selfish tendencies of the few who profit at the expense of the many, and that the people must control the government. It is somewhat curious to turn from Dr. Hicks's book, which proves that the farmers achieved the reforms they wanted, to to-day's newspapers, which reflect an agrarian discontent that seems as pervasive as that of a generation ago. The author does not permit himself to explore the larger agricultural problem here suggested, but he offers a clue to his view of it when he alludes (p. 237) to the farmer as waging "a long and perhaps a losing struggle—the struggle to save agricultural America from the devouring jaws of industrial America". That the Populist movement was significant in other respects than as paving the way for reforms is perhaps insufficiently recognized by the author. The revolt seems to have contributed something to the sweeping away of outworn issues, to a more realistic politics. In state and local fields the farmers won considerable redress of grievance at the time. Economically the movement gave them some experience in coöperation. The social aspects of the crusade would seem to merit considerable attention from the point of view of understanding the life of the American farmer in the last generation.

Dr. Hicks writes clearly and forcefully, often with distinction of style. His text is, on the whole, well organized, though in its weaving it has possibly suffered a trifle from the fact that so many of the chapters were originally prepared as articles. The author weighs his material with good judgment and with not a little insight into the queer complexities of human motives and acts. He uses his sources skillfully. He does not forget that he is dealing with "a pentecost of politics in which a tongue of flame sat upon every man", and he quotes liberally from the utterances that the farmers, their leaders, and their opponents gave forth—even songs and ballads. He has an eye for the extraordinarily colorful personalities in the farmers' crusade, and the reader will enjoy his vignettes of such figures as Mrs. Lease, "Sockless" Jerry Simpson, "Pitchfork" Ben Tillman, "Calamity" Weller, Ignatius Donnelly, and James B. Weaver.

Well chosen illustrations and maps add considerably to the interest of the narrative. An appendix supplies the texts of the platforms adopted by Farmers' Alliance and Populist conventions. A carefully organized critical bibliography evidences the thoroughness of the author's search for material and will prove a boon to students of the period. The index is slightly anæmic for so robust and admirable a book.

The University of Minnesota. THEODORE C. BLEGEN.

Beveridge and the Progressive Era. By CLAUDE G. BOWERS. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1932. Pp. xxv, 610. $5.00.)

SENATOR BEVERIDGE owed his first recognition to his eloquence; he won his enduring success by untiring industry, self-discipline, and a highly trained appreciation of the power of the word. He deliberately schooled himself to be an orator, passing from an imitation of early bad models to a position second to none of the best. In that progress he formed a method of preparation and a manner of expression that enabled him to write an American biography that stands easily among the first. His life was one of combat, for he had Scotch blood, and from the humblest beginnings he was to win the leading place as a campaigner in politics and an unquestioned recognition as an author. The same qualities stood him in stead in both occupations. In politics his honesty and integrity of purpose could not be questioned. Whatever subject he took up—imperialism, defense of the trusts, meat inspection, child labor, and abuses of the tariff—he sought to master the detail and attain a clarity of exposition that could not be misinterpreted. His political speeches were frankly partisan, crude and weak in argument in the early period, models of exposition and denunciation in the later; always powerfully influencing the hearers, even when allowance is made for the readiness of an already convinced audience to respond. He became the recognized spokesman of policy, making whirlwind journeys across the continent in the presidential campaigns, spending himself freely in the local contests and without reward, often to the sacrifice of his own interests. Rejected by his own party, he took enthusiastically to the Progressive party, but only on the assurance of its sincere purpose to carry on its protest against social ills due to partial laws, and when that party, deserted by its leader, disappeared he returned to the Republican party, somewhat disillusioned and thoroughly weary of the turmoil and low state of politics, yet again to serve in campaign work, and again without reward.

His career in the Senate had given him a standing beyond his years—he was thirty-six when he entered. Twelve years later he left that body with a wider outlook, an intimate knowledge of legislation, of administration, and of political methods, and a nearer approach to the people—the real workers—than he had on entering. He had fought major battles, had been betrayed by his pretended friends, and had seen his favorite measures go down in defeat, only to reappear later and be accepted. But he was the best of losers. His overconfidence in himself ripened into an optimism that, joined to his great enthusiasm and equally great vitality, made him an inspiration. It was not necessary to agree with him in opinion; he welcomed controversy; but he so positively expressed his views and convictions as to win respect and admiration. Defeated by enemies or deserted by friends, he did not harbor resentment or desire for revenge, but turned to the work

before him. He had an enthusiastic following in Indiana, one that demanded too much of him in later years, and his great capacity for making friends, for interesting them in what he had in hand, and for showing appreciation for aid and counsel, seemed to grow as he prepared for his great adventure. His whole life went into his *Marshall* and *Lincoln*. He carried into them a love of truth, a research, a wide experience of men, and a fully matured judgment that gave a merited success, more lasting than anything done for lawmaking or for advancing his political party. Few, if indeed any, could have predicted such a passage and outcome. All the greater was the deserved recognition that came to him in such volume.

His earliest thoughts were turned to oratory, because of the influence it exercised over others. He listened to the campaign speakers of the day, that pitiful "bloody shirt" period, and imitated them, from Logan to Ingersoll. He worked his way through college largely by winning prizes in speaking, and won the interstate oratorical contest. At twenty-four he spoke from the stump, attacking Cleveland for being what Beveridge himself later became, and he took up the study of law, a sobering influence. He soon saw that his expression needed reform and the schooling of self that followed was characteristic and taught him the virtues of drudgery in preparation. Not only did the substance of his speeches improve, but the manner of delivery also; yet even in this formative time he was acknowledged the first orator, the most effective speaker in Indiana, and thenceforward was in demand in every political contest. Not satisfied, he continued to study the art until it became natural to him, and he had few rivals at any period in the selection of words and framing of sentences so as to hold the attention and enforce his opinions. The war with Spain fired his imagination and political ambition. He was an imperialist, wanted the United States to take its place in world politics, asserted "there was no such thing as isolation in the world to-day", and, though not endorsed by the party leaders, made an independent campaign for the United States Senate and won. Visiting the Philippines before taking his seat, he made a deep impression by his first speech, a thoroughgoing appeal for an imperialist policy.

As a member of the Senate he was a regular in party allegiance, too exacting in his committee expectations, and unmindful of the traditions of that most conservative body. He gained the confidence of the leaders, sat with them in directing the course of legislation, and also exercised his independence of thought in such a manner as to raise antagonisms. He refused to be a silent and inactive member and turned to measures of social justice that threatened the well-entrenched interests of privilege. The need of government inspection of meat products, the evils of child labor, and the abuse of tariff legislation led him away from the dominant influences and into the strong—yet short-lived—insurgent movement of 1909, involving his de-

feat in Indiana and marking the end of his public service. His interest in public affairs was heightened and he wrote much on them in a popular form, a campaign of education for writer and readers. The outbreak of the World War opened to him the opportunity of sounding European opinion and he became an intense nationalist, a position that made him utterly opposed to a League of Nations, a World Court, or any alliance that could affect the independent action of America. Questions arising from the war took the place of those on abuses of capitalism or the trend of materialism. Believing that the Republican party alone contained what was safe and sound, he nevertheless threw himself into the Progressive party and lost by the selfish conduct of Roosevelt, whom he greatly admired. Disgusted with the course of politics he turned to realize an ambition he had long held, and in writing the career of John Marshall he found a fitting occupation for his abilities, new and responsive friends, and a triumph, as yet not fully realized, overshadowing in importance all that he had done in politics. His activity in behalf of the American Historical Association was a labor of love on his part, felt also as an obligation in return for his association with its members.

It was not an easy task to write the life of such a man, so as to preserve the contrasts, measure the steady development of character, and to be just to the ambitions and performance of such a public character. Mr. Bowers has produced a biography that is more than excellent and has put into it qualities of his own that enhance its great merits. He is himself of Indiana, familiar with the political history of the state and a warm admirer of Beveridge; he has himself engaged in practical politics and journalism, and he has steeped himself in the past history of parties, as a partisan, but leaning towards that wider sympathy that true historical study encourages. He writes forcibly and vividly, with the useful bias of an insider, and a sense of proportion. He has given in the volume much local and national history, basing the study on the abundant records freely placed at his disposal, and he has with skill and power placed Beveridge in the center of action. Of the opposition, his comments and reminders are helpful and to the purpose, and he has written a new chapter, that of the rise and fall of the Progressive party. In no sense a partisan biography, the book presents an excellent picture of the march of political conflict and is eminently fair in its account of men and measures. His character sketches—such as Quay and the progressive senators—cannot be bettered and, in full sympathy with his subject, Mr. Bowers tells a rapidly moving and absorbing story.

Paris. WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

Newton D. Baker: America at War. By FREDERICK PALMER. Two volumes. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1931. Pp. xiv, 421; x, 451. $7.50.)

Transporting the A. E. F. in Western Europe, 1917–1919. By WILLIAM

J. Wilgus, Member, Military Railway Commission to England and France, Director of Military Railways, A. E. F., Deputy Director General of Transportation, A. E. F. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1931. Pp. xxviii, 612. $12.50.)

Colonel Palmer's important contribution to the literature of the World War blends history, biography, and reminiscence. Rich as is its documentation, from the War Department correspondence, the personal files of Secretary Baker and General Bliss, and other sources, many of its affirmations rest on "statements to the author" by thirty-nine participants in the actions narrated. More than one-fifth of the footnotes refer to testimony of this sort, which is supplemented by liberal drafts on the author's own memories of men and events.

As a portrait of the war-time Secretary, these volumes are of highest interest. Mr. Baker's "power from the President was as supreme as Pershing's from Baker. History holds no higher example of the one-two-three delegation of authority." Convinced by his study of history that civilian interference with commanders in the field was dangerous, the Secretary conceived his rôle simply. "Select a commander in whom you have confidence; give him power and responsibility, and then . . . work your own head off to get him everything he needs and support him in every decision he makes." Mr. Baker's steadfast loyalty, his determination to keep politics out of appointments, his patience under criticism and readiness to take responsibility are so justly stressed that some readers may doubt whether "inevitable fate . . . permits no Secretary of War to be a hero".

As a history of the actual achievement of the War Department Colonel Palmer's work is less satisfactory. The explanation of the failure to make better preparations before the declaration of war leaves much to be desired. In rebutting the criticisms of Theodore Roosevelt, Harvey, and Pershing, the author scores many points, such as his account of Pershing's two sets of instructions (I. 170–173). He seeks to throw much of the blame for delay in deliveries on changes in the requisitions from overseas. On the moot point of the "big divisions" his charge that our divisional organization was "wished on us" by the French staff is unsupported, and his statement that no European nation changed the size of its divisions during or after the war is incorrect. The extended discussion of the problem of venereal disease scarcely indicates the extent to which war-time control followed army regulations antedating Mr. Baker's advent to the War Department.

Colonel Palmer makes important contributions to the story of interallied coöperation, but leaves the early stages of our policy as to military participation still obscure. Significant portions of Mr. Baker's letter of May 8, 1917, to President Wilson, which appeared in the serialized version of the book, have been deleted (I. 167). New light is thrown on the origin of the plan to dispatch 150 battalions for service with the British (II. 108–117). Too

much stress is laid, however, on the Secretary's suggestion to General Pershing on December 25, 1917, that "places might be selected for your forces nearer the junction of the British and French lines which would enable you to throw your strength in whichever direction seemed most necessary". Even if Pershing had been willing to move his forces a hundred miles from their railheads under construction to a zone where French and American lines of communication would have been inextricably entangled, the French would not have consented to the shift.

Although Colonel Palmer expresses his conviction that "by the summer of 1918 the home effort was better organized than that in France", he succeeds better in depicting the magnitude of the problems raised than in analyzing the steps taken by the War Department to meet them. In sharp contrast Colonel Wilgus's monumental work keeps constantly before the reader the actual progress being made month by month in providing the tonnage and transport on which success depended. It is of capital importance not only for the student of military organization and logistics but for the diplomatic historian, for the Associated Powers naturally looked to our performance rather than to the programs we offered. Secretary Baker's reminiscent description of the transportation situation in March, 1918 (Frothingham, *American Reinforcement in the World War,* pp. 238–239), should be compared with the stark facts of Wilgus's narrative. "Over a year after we had entered the War, we had contributed not a single man toward the movement of our troops and supplies over the sorely tried French railroads, not a man toward their track maintenance, only 60 per cent. of the force required for the maintenance of equipment, and less than three-quarters of the men needed for discharging vessels." In the autumn of 1918 the situation was rapidly approaching a crisis, as the Americans faced, in military transportation, "by far the greatest task of its kind that the world had ever known". On the eve of the armistice the daily average tonnage discharged at the ports was "but 65 per cent of the needs of the hour", while the train mileage was but forty-one per cent. of the calculated requirements. Much of the difficulty was due to inadequate peace-time provision for a transportation service and to faulty staff organization. "Within a period of some sixteen months the duties of the Transportation Service, and its relation to higher authority, underwent eight radical changes." Thanks to Foch's insistence in April on shipment of American infantry and machine gun units at the expense of railway equipment, the cart was placed before the horse and vast numbers of men were sent to be transported from the base ports to the front in advance of the means of transport. That so much could be accomplished in the face of these and countless other difficulties is an everlasting tribute to the Transportation Corps, A. E. F.

Harvard University. JAMES P. BAXTER, 3RD.

Problems of the Pacific, 1931. Proceedings of the Fourth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hangchow and Shanghai, China, October 21 to November 2. Edited by BRUNO LASKER. Assisted by W. I. Holland, Acting Research Secretary. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1932. Pp. xi, 548. $5.00.)

THIS volume is a record of the round-table discussions of the Fourth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It contains, in addition, extracts from the materials prepared for the conference and from addresses delivered at the general sessions. It will thus be obvious that the normal standards of reviewing are not applicable to it. Lacking in unity to a great extent, as a book of this character must necessarily be, it does contain within its covers a vast amount of information bearing upon the problems discussed. To this extent it is a useful addition to the volumes of similar nature which appeared following the Honolulu conference of 1927 and Kyoto conference of 1929.

The present work is organized in five parts dealing with (1) Economic Relations in the Pacific, (2) China's Economic Development, (3) Political Relations in the Pacific, (4) China's International Relations, and (5) Cultural Relations in the Pacific. One difficulty which the editors have in particular attempted to overcome is the unavoidable repetition of arguments at round-table discussions occasioned in part by the changing membership of the conferences. Their object as stated by them has been to "reproduce important new information and to indicate the trend of thinking on a given subject rather than to present a rounded statement of *all* significant facts and opinions". Judged in this light the volume fulfills in a clear and readable style its purpose.

Problems of the Pacific, 1931, it should further be noted, bears witness to one of the major accomplishments of the institute. It will be recalled that the Manchurian crisis broke forth just five weeks before the convening of the conference and the bitterness engendered might well have wrecked discussion in so far at least as Japanese and Chinese delegates were concerned. Nevertheless, Dr. Hu Shih, president of the conference, was able to say in his opening address:

> This Conference has been made possible by a tardy realization on the part of its Japanese and Chinese members that, whatever calamities may have befallen their respective countries through the folly of their political leaders, some good may yet result from the coming together and the thinking together of the enlightened men and women of the various nations, and the application of scientific method both in research and discussion in international affairs.

In the main it may be said that this spirit is representative of the data papers and the summaries of discussions edited by Mr. Lasker.

The conference was, indeed, too close in point of time to events in Man-

churia for its discussions to have any great significance. Nevertheless its discussions on the inadequacy of the diplomatic machinery of the Pacific were not without value. The conference was led to the conclusion that the greatest defect in the diplomatic machinery was "its inability to do justice to the imponderable psychological factors in situations where the emotions are deeply stirred" (p. 222).

For the student of Far Eastern history perhaps the most useful section of the book is part II. dealing with China's economic development. To the general student it should convey some appreciation of the complexity of problems which the institute must face in future conferences.

The University of Kentucky. PAUL HIBBERT CLYDE.

SHORTER NOTICES

Histoire Ancienne. Deuxième Partie, *Histoire Grecque.* Par Gustave Glotz, Membre de l'Institut, Professeur à la Sorbonne, avec la Collaboration de Robert Cohen, Professeur au Lycée Henri IV. Tome II., *La Grèce au V^e^ Siècle.* [Histoire Générale, publiée sous la Direction de Gustave Glotz.] (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1931, pp. 800, 75 fr.) The work of Glotz and his collaborator is, aside from the *Cambridge Ancient History,* the most important history of Greece to appear since the first publication of the epoch-making works of Meyer, Busolt, and Beloch. It obviously is desirable to have an account that takes into consideration recent scholarship and that also possesses the unity that can come only from unity of authorship. Nevertheless, a volume on a subject discussed as frequently as fifth century Greece must be ready to pass a severe test. It should be accurate and sufficiently full in its technical aids, well written, and should have something constructive to contribute to the interpretation of the period. Measured by this standard, the study under consideration cannot claim perfection but ranks high enough to deserve a warm welcome.

The technical aids are good. It is true that every scholar will regret omissions in the longer bibliographical notes, and yet these furnish a useful guide to additional literature. Shorter notes cite the sources and occasionally secondary literature on specific points. These frequently call attention to divergent interpretations of controversial questions but sometimes fail to supply all that is needed. On page 52 there is nothing to indicate why the elder Alcibiades is included among the first statesmen to be ostracized at Athens, nor is there anything in connection with the statement made on page 151 that after the Battle of Tanagra Pericles secured the recall of Cimon, to warn the student that he is face to face with a controversial problem. There are also a few inaccuracies in the references to the sources. Thus note 101 on page 696 cites only Thuc. vii. 16–17 for the dispatch of Athenian and Pelo-

ponnesian forces to Sicily and fails to include chapter 19 in which the greater part of the information concerning the Peloponnesian forces is given. At the end of the volume there is a twenty-two page index and a rather full table of contents.

The descriptive part of the volume is the most valuable. The account of social and economic conditions is sane and moderate. The accomplishment of the Athenians in industry and commerce is told with enthusiasm, but the reader is warned that Athenian industry never passed the embryonic stage. Under the circumstances it is a little surprising to find the Athenian citizen body estimated at 138,000; the metics, at 70,000; and the slaves, as high as 200,000 or 210,000. In the narrative parts, emphasis is placed on the influence of prominent men: Themistocles, Pericles, Alcibiades, Lysander, and others. Throughout the volume Athens is always to the fore. She is considered the real saviour of Greece in the Persian War and naturally is even more prominent in other sections. In those sections for which the sources are full, the authors are conservative in their criticism. Where the sources give only scattered details, they are not afraid of bold reconstructions.

The University of Chicago. JAKOB A. O. LARSEN.

Römische Geschichte. Erste Hälfte, *Die Römische Republik.* Von Joseph Vogt, Professor an der Universität Würzburg. Zweite Hälfte, *Die Römische Kaiserzeit.* Von Dr. Julius Wolf, Professor am Bundesrealgymnasium in Mödling bei Wien. [Geschichte der Führenden Völker, herausgegeben von Heinrich Finke, Hermann Junker, Gustav Schnürer, Bänden VI., VII.] (Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder and Company, 1932, pp. 350; 286, $3.15; $2.50.) Vogt's volume is in the same historical series as the *Griechische Geschichte* of Berve, which was reviewed here last January. Intended for general readers, it has no burden of footnotes and argues no thesis. Vogt aims to be adequate within the prescribed limits, just in proportion and emphasis, honest and sane in interpretation, lucid and yet compact in presentation, and he succeeds admirably. He has employed the early archæological material with wisdom and restraint, he has the courage to omit much of the tralatitian hypothetical lumber about the early constitution, he reveals a complete grasp of source materials and of extensive publications, and, best of all, he has given a fresh explanation—not without political insight—of the confused cross currents of the late republic. The author has in fact caught something of Mommsen's spirit, which we have missed so painfully in the many immature and smart dissertations on Republican history of recent years. The reading of this volume repeatedly reminded me of what a Göttingen professor stated some twenty years ago: "Without some experience in democratic politics, we can hardly learn to comprehend the politics of Cicero's day." Vogt seems to me to understand.

One can, of course, find flaws in any book. In this one, cultural and economic history receive less attention than one could wish. Vogt is too certain that the Saguntine treaty was signed in 220; he yields hasty credence to the recent hypothesis that Roman agrarian interests destroyed Carthage and to the equally recent guess that the enemies of Scipio elected Flamininus. And there are other signs of haste. But the book as a whole is excellent and deserves success.

The volume on the Empire by Wolf, on the other hand, is a failure. Wolf apparently writes for *primaner,* neglects facts for platitudes, stresses the unimportant in cultural history, utters naïve solemnities about religion and politics, and betrays a surprising ignorance of the sources. A man who places Diodorus in Nero's reign and mentions him as a source for imperial history should hardly have undertaken this task.

The Johns Hopkins University. TENNEY FRANK.

The Growth of Political Thought in the West, from the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages. By Charles Howard McIlwain, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government in Harvard University. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. vii, 417, $3.50.) At a time when many of the political dogmas and axioms of the past century are being reëxamined, and when new governmental experiments are being tried, it is natural that there should be a revival of interest in the political theories of the past and of the methods that have been used to solve the perpetual problem of adjusting human relationships. In the volume under review, Professor McIlwain traces the development of political thought in the Western World from the Greek period to the close of the Middle Ages. The ideas of Plato and Aristotle have been so thoroughly analyzed by many able scholars that there is little that can be added; hence, in discussing the Greek period, the author follows well-established lines. In the chapter on Roman political thought the author makes a distinct contribution in his discussion of the influence of Stoic philosophy and the development of scientific jurisprudence.

The chapters on the medieval period are, perhaps, the most valuable portions of the book. Following Carlyle in the main, the author gives a clear and scholarly treatment of the controversy between ecclesiastical and secular authority, devoting especial attention to the development of the theory of law. His emphasis on the important changes which took place in political theory between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries is especially valuable. Among these the author mentions the revived study of Roman law, the contact of Western Europe with the ethical and political writings of Aristotle, the growth of the common law in England, and the development of the medieval system of representative institutions. Especial attention is given to the outburst of polemical writings that accompanied the struggle between popes and

emperors between 1085 and 1112, and to the theories of Egidius Romanus and of John of Salisbury in the later period of the controversy. The theory of the Conciliar Movement is treated rather sketchily, but due attention is given to the beginnings of theories of sovereignty, of legislation, and of royal supremacy that accompanied the rise of national states at the close of the medieval period.

If any criticism were to be made of this excellent volume, it would be that the author gives too much attention to the development of the theory of law, to the neglect of other aspects of political thought. On the other hand, this emphasis on the legalistic aspects of political thought gives a certain unity to the treatment that has decided value. Another strong feature of the work is the attention given by the author to the reasons why particular theories arose, and to the process of development by which the ideas of one period grew out of those that preceded them. It is to be hoped that Professor McIlwain will follow this volume by others that will deal with the political thought of modern times.

The University of California. RAYMOND G. GETTELL.

Hellenistic Queens: a Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt. By Grace Harriet Macurdy, Professor of Greek in Vassar College. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, edited by David M. Robinson, no. 14.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, pp. xv, 250, $4.00.) Professor Macurdy has gathered together the little that we know about the queens of Macedonia, Syria, and Egypt in a gallant determination to show that they ill deserve the general condemnation with which historians have dismissed them. Few were really bad and perhaps these were as much sinned against as sinning. Some were able and virtuous, many were the helpless victims of circumstances. There is a certain amount of special pleading in the book not always harmonious with the author's conscientious style. As a source book it is excellent; as a work of literature it suffers severely from the fragmentary and controversial nature of the sources themselves. One emerges with the feeling that, after all, the wickedest queens were the most interesting; Olympias, the terrible mother of Alexander the Great, Asinoë II., of whom the author says, "I believe that no record of a single good deed on her part has been handed down to us", and the last and most famous of the Cleopatras.

Aside from the biographies there is a good discussion of the status of Hellenistic queens in which it is clearly shown that the basis of their power was personal and not constitutional.

The reader will be grateful for the portraits with which the book is illustrated. He would have been glad also of a few family trees to help him keep in mind the awful complexity of Hellenistic royal relationships.

Yale University. ALFRED R. BELLINGER.

Kriegs- und Wanderzüge: Weltgeschichte als Völkerbewegung. Von Alexander und Eugen Kulischer. (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1932, pp. viii, 230, 17 M.) The student of migrations will find in this work a much needed revaluation of the mechanics of this subject (ch. I., especially). Further, in revealing that much of the misery and war that has visited the human race was the result of the movements of peoples in search of food, the authors insist that the problem of the relation of population to subsistence area is a matter of international rather than national concern.

In evolving this generalization the authors have made an exhaustive study of migrations during three periods of history. The Arab advances provoked a series of related folk and war movements reaching, on the one side, from North Africa to the Dnieper and, on the other, from Mesopotamia through south Russia to the Balkans. The Norse exodus, for example, is one of the links in this chain of events. During the period of absolutism (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries) the national army had become the reservoir for the surplus population. Agriculture and trade, however, were not equal to supporting this burden, which grew heavier as the population increased; in consequence, large elements moved from place to place occasionally finding refuge but more often causing further dislocation. During the nineteenth century the expansion of peoples was world-wide and population increased enormously. With the exhaustion of readily accessible subsistence lands the surplus masses turned to the industrial centers which could not support them. The "psychopathische Strategie" prevalent on the eve of the World War was engendered by the awesome spectacle of actual or imminent pressure for which no mechanism of control existed.

This brief description hardly does justice to the meticulous precision of the writing, the able analyses of cause and effect, or the high standard of documentation that support the thesis of the book. The statement that the Negroes recently emigrating from the South were replaced by Mexican laborers jars us slightly, but this and other aberrations may be passed over in a work of such broad scope.

Princeton University. J. E. Pomfret.

The First Century of English Feudalism, 1066–1166. By F. M. Stenton, Fellow of the British Academy, Professor of History in the University of Reading. [The Ford Lectures, delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1929.] (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1932, pp. vii, 311, $4.00.) Professor Stenton is a follower of Round, but he does more than "reap after". He has written a book which is both original and important. In his study of English feudalism he leaves the traditional standpoint of the king and his court and takes that of the knights and barons, their "social organization". He reverses Maitland's dic-

tum of the dark age "beyond" Domesday, believing that for feudalism at least the dark age is the century this side. The centralization of Glanville's time marked a new era about which we have known much, but more may be known by a better understanding of the century before. The author's English feudalism stands out sharply from both Anglo-Saxon and Continental feudalism, yet he takes the present orthodox view that it was institutionally derived from the latter and thinks Maitland overworked analogies between pre- and post-Conquest feudal England.

The sources used are largely private charters, enfeoffments of one sort or another—many new or but slightly used before, others used largely for genealogy. One is surprised at the amount of material now available in local collections, and much more still to be explored, in this period before the chancery enrollments.

Some leading themes: the non-Norman elements coming to England in the Conqueror's time or after, and affecting feudalism; feudal family settlements, autonomous nature of honors before *mort d'ancestor,* and honors as not necessarily the largest holdings, but those conferring distinction; a new study of the Conqueror's "scattering of the fiefs", and later scatterings; elaborate baronial households and developing household officials; "barons" as the greater vassals of lords and not solely royal tenants-in-chief—the Salisbury oath applying to the honorial baronage; numerous grants of higher criminal justice even by mesne lords; thegns and knights (the best discussion to be found); the personal side of knight service, the developing knight's fee, the strangely mixed content of early knight service, especially castle-guard, including much on early castles, "adulterine" and lawful; a fresh study of scutage; much on early earldoms and palatinates; and concluding with a view of Stephen's reign which presents the feudal baronage not so much getting out of hand under a weak king as all classes suffering from the civil war of a disputed succession. There is a hint of Henry II. as far more than the restorer and developer of what Henry I. had begun—a constructive governmental genius like the Conqueror. Henry II. is exalted, Henry I. diminished somewhat.

The University of Minnesota. A. B. WHITE.

And so began the Irish Nation. By Seamus MacCall. (London and New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1931, pp. xvii, 475, 12*s.* 6*d.*). The group of Irish writers of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries to whom is due the long-accepted version of the pre-Christian history of Ireland has received from Dr. Eóin MacNeill the designation of "the synthetic historians". Their history "is partly fabricated, and partly made up of mythology, legend and epic narrative, arranged under an arbitrary chronology" adopted from Eusebius and St. Jerome. Should some MacNeill of a future age have occa-

sion to classify the present work, he will probably describe it as a synthetic history, in which myth, legend, and epic are fitted into a framework, not of Biblical chronology but of the results of modern archæological investigation. Mr. MacCall's archæology, in spite of the dogmatic treatment of many unsettled problems, is, in the main, well-founded; his amalgamation therewith of literary material, drawn from manuscripts of the eleventh century of our era and later, to produce "a coherent and comprehensive story of the origin and evolution of the Irish nation" during more than two millenia preceding the birth of Christ is, at the best, highly imprudent. Minor errors cannot here be enumerated: the early Christian poet Sedulius is "one of Ireland's earliest poets" and a disciple of Ailbe of Emly; Tighernach is still "the first critical historian of Ireland"; the inscription which a Roman cavalry officer erected at Hexham in thanksgiving to the gods for victory over, it would seem, a band of Irish raiders is offered as evidence that St. Patrick was an Irishman. The numerous illustrations from the author's own drawings will be found valuable, but his references to authorities, described as 'rather an acknowledgment of debts', are, for the serious student, almost useless, and in some cases (*e.g.*, on pp. 30–31, 80, 123, 149, 244, 376–379) unintelligible.

J. F. K.

Die Fränkische Kultur und der Islam, mit Besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nordischen Entwicklung: eine Universalhistorische Studie. Von Dr. Erna Patzelt, Privatdozent an der Wiener Universität. (Vienna, Verlag Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1932, pp. 244, 15 M.) The matter at issue in this erudite disquisition is M. Henri Pirenne's ingenious thesis that it was the expansion of Islam rather than the Teutonic invasions, which gave Europe its properly medieval orientation. The author, a pupil of Professor Alfons Dopsch of Vienna, endeavors to show, first, that Pirenne's premise of a unified Mediterranean civilization surviving in its essential features down to the end of the Merovingian epoch, is an assumption without real warrant. She contends, in the next place, that Pirenne has undervalued the contribution made by the Teutons to early medieval civilization; and with the aim of providing the perspective which to her seems indispensable for a just estimate of the importance of this contribution, she presents a somewhat prolix exposition of the development of Teutonic *Eigenkultur* from neolithic times to the sixth century of our era. According to Dr. Patzelt, Pirenne has greatly exaggerated the results of the Muslim conquests and in particular their effects upon Europe. Available evidence, it is argued, does not bear out the alleged closure of the Mediterranean by the Muslims (pp. 210 ff., 233 f.). After the Hellenistic period (*cf.* pp. 23 ff.) the Mediterranean ceased to be the principal, all-important highway of commerce joining Occident with Levant; the Romans had a marked preference for land routes, and these, along with river

routes, eventually came to be utilized much more than the sea (pp. 160 ff.). Many facts are marshalled in support of the view that the decline of urban life in the West and the process by which the East became differentiated from the West were all but complete *before* the appearance of Islam (pp. 29–61, 156–157).

Rejecting the opposite interpretation of Pirenne, and relying in considerable measure on the researches of Dopsch, Vogel, A. Bugge, and J. W. Thompson, our author insists that during the Carolingian period commerce in the Frankish realm registered not shrinkage but expansion (pp. 230 ff.). In the judgment of the reviewer, Dr. Patzelt has demonstrated that Pirenne's thesis, far from being unassailable, does not, in several respects, rest upon firm ground. But it may hardly be declared utterly demolished.

The University of Chicago. EINAR JORANSON.

Lodewijk van Velthem's Voortzetting van den Spiegel Historiael, 1248–1316. Opnieuw uitgegeven door Herman Vander Linden, Willem de Vreese, en Paul De Keyser. Tweede deel. [Académie Royale de Belgique, Commission Royale d'Histoire.] (Brussels, Lamertin, 1931, pp. viii, 440.) It is a pleasure to receive the second volume of this edition of Lodewijk van Velthem's chronicle. The Commission Royale d'Histoire published the first volume in 1906. Professor Vander Linden enjoyed the help of Professor De Vreese in this undertaking. The World War broke out in 1914 while the second volume was in press. Only 120 pages were printed. Dr. De Vreese discontinued his coöperation after the war because of the Flamingant difficulties in which he had taken active interest. Lodewijk van Velthem's chronicle begins with 1248. Until 1300 it is drawn from sources which are for the most part known, but from that date onward the narrative is based upon the testimony of eyewitnesses. The author was a priest, lived in Antwerp, and was well acquainted with the duke of Brabant. The volume under review contains the third and fourth books of the chronicle, and deals with Emperors Adolph of Nassau and Albrecht of Austria, the war between Edward I. and Philip the Fair, and the complicated relations of the count of Flanders with the count of Hainault, Holland, and Zeeland. Especially interesting is the description of the Welsh (p. 229) who accompanied Edward to Flanders. The author's account of the Battle of Courtrai (1302) is a classic. Hitherto scholars have been dependent upon the scarce and defective edition provided by Isaac le Long (Amsterdam, 1727). It is to be hoped that writers in the English speaking world will no longer disregard this most important source for the affairs of Edward I. The chronicler's point of view is essentially Netherlandish. It well illustrates how a person living in the flourishing part of Antwerp at the opening of the fourteenth century viewed contemporary events.

The University of Washington. HENRY S. LUCAS.

Histoire du Limousin et de la Marche. Par J. Nouillac. *Histoire du Comté de Nice.* Par Robert Latouche. *Histoire de Bretagne.* Par Auguste Dupouy. [Les Vieilles Provinces de France, three volumes.] (Paris, Boivin et Cie., 1931, 1932, 1932, pp. 275, 263, 424. 18 fr., 18 fr., 24 fr.) These volumes prove once more the value of the provincial approach to French history. They not only furnish a wealth of specific examples for all the major forces which have produced the French nation as we know it, but they demonstrate effectively both the continuity and the variety of these factors in widely-separated geographic areas. They contain a few statements of dubious accuracy and an occasional comment hardly defensible except frankly as a matter of opinion, yet they easily maintain the excellent reputation of the series of which they form a part. Provincial patriotism is not lacking, but it is not excessive. There is a pervasive atmosphere of scholarship, despite the lack of footnotes; the illustrations are numerous, well-chosen, and illuminating.

The volume on the Limousin is remarkably successful. The author has made the most of the position of his province on the borders of three sharply contrasting districts, the Capetian north, the Albigensian south, and (in the medieval period) the Plantagenet west. There are admirable chapters on the cultural history of the province at various epochs, on the Limousin papacy of the fourteenth century, and on the religious revival in the Limousin in the seventeenth. The pages dealing with the period since 1815, as might be expected, are the least impressive. The county of Nice, one of the smallest of the French provinces and not French at all during a large part of its existence, has played an extraordinary rôle in both French and European history, partly because of its access to the sea combined with protection on the north by a mountain wall against both men and weather, partly because Savoy, Italy, and France have necessarily faced each other across its boundaries. All this the author has brought out vividly. The chapters devoted to the Roman period are not inspired and the chapter on the medieval commune is not clear. The nineteenth century, however, usually so disappointing in these provincial histories, appears for once with a distinct interest of its own, thanks to the growing fortunes of Nice as a *ville de saison* and to the stirring events of Italian (and French) unification. Brittany would seem to have offered the best opportunity of the three subjects here considered; actually the author has been the least successful. He writes with authority and he has some good chapters, notably those devoted to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In general, however, there are too many facts and far too many names. The whole book could have been very profitably and very considerably condensed. The volume on Nice has a valuable bibliographical note, revealing among other things the special qualifications of the

author for his subject; the other volumes do not offer bibliographical information. None of these volumes possesses an index.

Smith College. SIDNEY R. PACKARD.

Owen Glendower, Owen Glyn Dŵr. By J. E. Lloyd. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1931, pp. xiv, 161, $3.50.) This biography is an expansion of the lectures which the author, as Ford lecturer, delivered at Oxford in 1920. The picture he draws for us, which makes no startling departures from the traditional portrait, is of a cultured North Wales landowner, a descendant of the princes of Powys, suddenly in September, 1400, declaring himself Prince of Wales, burning Ruthin, the seat of his powerful neighbor, Lord Grey, and ravaging the English border. The immediate occasion for this outbreak was probably a quarrel over land but its real causes lie under an obscurity that even the author has not been able to pierce.

There followed ten years of continuous warfare, Glyn Dŵr striving to capture the English castles in Wales and to extend his rule over the South. One of the most interesting and significant aspects of the whole story is the bargain which Glyn Dŵr struck, when, as a result of the French alliance, he decided to recognize the Avignon pope; for he insisted that the Welsh Church was to be independent and provided with Welsh speaking clerics, and the country was to have two universities, one for the North and one for the South. Here, indeed, is more than the germ of the idea of nationality: it is the idea itself, fully developed.

Professor Lloyd's book is a real contribution to the literature of the history of Wales and one that inspires complete confidence in the soundness of his scholarship and the fairness of his conclusions. That it leaves the reviewer slightly discontented may partly be due to the scantiness of the material the author had to work with, but it may also be because, in his presentation of it, he has been content with a rather bald statement of the facts and has not given enough attention to such phases and factors, for instance, as the Scottish and French distractions and the emergence of the idea of nationality. On the whole, however, the book is a worthy biography of a man whom Mr. Trevelyan calls "an attractive and unique figure in a period of debased and selfish politics".

There is an appendix on the Welsh Sources for the History of the Glyn Dŵr Movement and an index.

The Library of Congress. JOHN GRIFFITHS.

La Lega di Lepanto nel Carteggio Diplomatico Inedito di Don Luys de Torres, Nunzio Straordinario di S. Pio V. a Filippo II. Par A. Dragonetti de Torres. (Turin, Fratelli Bocca, 1931, pp. 270.) This work is primarily a

collection of seventy-three documents from the archives of the family of Dragonetti de Torres. A member of that house, Monsignore Luis de Torres, who was a native of Malaga, migrated to Italy, and rose in the Church to be bishop of Bologna and a highly-regarded papal diplomat. In 1570 Pius V. selected him to head a special mission as Extraordinary nuncio to the Spanish court to secure the adherence of Philip II. to the projected Holy League. The background for the mission lies in the Turkish descent on the Venetian stronghold of Cyprus and in the resulting scheme of Pius V. to form another alliance of the Christian maritime powers to check Ottoman naval aggression.

The writer, A. Dragonetti de Torres, was impelled to undertake this work partly by a statement in Pastor's *Geschichte der Päpste* (VIII. 552) that the embassy of Luis de Torres to Spain was of great importance and deserved special study. Pastor knew of the existence of the documents in the Dragonetti de Torres archive from incomplete copies he had found in the British Museum. But, as the editor of this correspondence points out, the British Museum copies omit a number of the documents relating to De Torres's mission which are fully reproduced in this work. Although some of this material has appeared in other collections, most of the correspondence is here printed in its entirety for the first time. The chief value of the book lies in the documents. To them the author has prefixed some sixty pages of explanatory matter; this is in the form of summary accounts of various topics or aspects of the situation, selected rather fortuitously. Some of these topics elucidate the diplomatic correspondence, notably in the biographical information given. Yet in some of the topical summaries the author raises controversial issues which he treats inadequately. His explanatory notes are, however, full, and they rest upon an extensive use of the printed sources for the period and of the best of the secondary works. The correspondence includes letters to and from the nuncio and dignitaries of the Spanish empire and the Roman Church, an exchange of communications between Philip II. and Pius V., a memorial from Luis de Torres to Philip, Venetian ambassadorial instructions, and reports from the nuncio to the papal secretary of state. Appended are a number of facsimile letters and autographs.

Amherst College. E. Dwight Salmon.

Oliver Cromwell: ein Kampf um Freiheit und Diktatur. Von Dr. Heinrich Bauer. (Munich, Verlag von R. Oldenbourg, 1932, pp. ix, 408, 9.50 M.) From his previous studies in Cromwellian materials, from Ranke, Carlyle, Gardiner, Firth, Clarendon, Thurloe, Rushworth, Whitelocke, Schlezer, and a list of other works which includes such various titles as Neal's *History of the Puritans,* Sprigge's *Anglia Rediviva,* and Anderson's *Memorable Women of Puritan Times,* Dr. Bauer has written a lively and popular life of the great Protector. Though the author expresses his indebtedness to Ranke as

his chief inspiration, his work partakes rather more of the current vogue for "psychological" history and dramatic presentation than that master might have allowed himself. Dr. Bauer does not go so far in that direction as some of its most recent and most widely-read exemplars, but he goes, perhaps, far enough. His style is vigorous and clear, inclining to the romantic and the spectacular, and is eminently readable. If one cannot agree wholly with the somewhat iridescent description of the book given on the jacket, one may at least admit that this is the liveliest of German biographies of Cromwell.

W. C. A.

The Superlative Prodigall: a Life of Thomas Bushell. By J. W. Gough, M. A., Lecturer in History in the University of Bristol, Lecturer at Oriel College, Oxford. [University of Bristol Studies, no. I.] (Bristol, J. W. Arrowsmith, 1932, pp. viii, 172, 5*s*.) Thomas Bushell, the "superlative prodigall" of this sketch, was a courtier in the household of Francis Bacon, who forsook politics and society after Bacon's fall to devote himself to the development of deep mining in Wales and Mendip. The characterization is taken from the title-page of an autobiographical fragment written during a period of seclusion on the islet known as the Calf of Man. Bushell lived there for three years in "a delightful solitairie Cave, where no fraud, pride nor deceipt inhabits". Meditating upon his sins, he formulated schemes for the development of mining. He declared that these projects were an outgrowth of the scientific work of Bacon, and his most substantial treatise on mining bears the title, *Mr. Bushell's Abridgement of the Lord Chancellor Bacon's Philosophical Theory in Mineral Productions.* The schemes were in reality mere applications of the German methods described in Agricola's *De Re Metallica,* known also to Bushell through his personal contacts with Joseph Hochstetter. The principal feature of the new technique was to drive drainage tunnels into the hills at low levels, so that the water in the working shafts might be carried away by gravity. Economies were also achieved by the use of a crude system of forced ventilation in place of the numerous ventilating shafts necessitated by old methods.

The first important work of Bushell was in the Welsh lead and silver mines at Cwmsymlog. The mines were successfully drained and work resumed with modest results (1637–1638). A mint was established at Aberystwyth castle to coin the silver from the mines of the district. During the period of the Civil War, this mint enabled Bushell to convert quickly into coin the silver plate contributed in the West to the royalist cause. After the war he was able to resume his work not only in Wales and Devonshire but also in Mendip.

From some points of view Bushell may seem to be hardly worth the careful study embodied in this volume, but there is so much danger of losing the

personal element in economic history that biographies are of real importance whenever sufficient material exists to make such a study possible. Bushell, too, presents many features of genuine interest and importance. He possessed the flair for promotion with all its incidental extravagances. Finance, in this early period, was a matter of real difficulty, and much ingenuity was required to keep out of the clutches of creditors. It is a significant chapter in the early history of technology and business enterprise.

Harvard University. ABBOTT PAYSON USHER.

William Blathwayt, a Late Seventeenth Century English Administrator. By Gertrude Ann Jacobsen, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of History and the Social Sciences in Hunter College. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, XXI.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xii, 508, $4.00.) Miss Jacobsen has found in the official life of William Blathwayt an excellent subject for biography and has justified the claim set forth in the preface to this book that Blathwayt "was a late Stuart administrator whose activities represent one stage in the evolution of England's civil service and fit into a critical period in constitutional development". The period is, from Miss Jacobsen's point of view, a critical one because its chief problem "was not parliamentary but executive and administrative, the creation of a smooth working, well oiled, and financially solvent governmental machine".

Assuming the truth of this general assertion—and it is by assumption rather than argument that we are asked to take it—Blathwayt may be regarded as a prominent figure. He held public office from 1668 to 1717 with no more than a few months intermission; he had experience of many departments, including at one and the same time plantations, war, secretary of state, and privy council, and he was in all his official activities a painstaking, conforming servant.

Miss Jacobsen has set forth this career in such adequate detail as to show the working of individual departments of government, the conflicts and compromises of relations between departments, and the contact of Parliament and the executive. She has been attentive also to the personal standards and opinions of Blathwayt himself, among which it is interesting to notice his admiration for the executive system and colonial policy of France.

The book is well arranged and written in a clear and simple style. Of faults there are few; an occasional callow witticism, such as "historical anaemia" for lack of historical record, and the omission in an otherwise full bibliography of reference to E. R. Turner's work on the privy council and to E. R. Adair's *Sources for the History of the Council in the 16th and 17th Centuries.*

Cornell University. FREDERICK GEORGE MARCHAM.

Om Umeå Lappmarks Svenska Kolonisation, från Mitten av 1500-Talet till Omkring, 1750. Akademisk Avhandling av Gustaf Göthe. (Uppsala, Almquist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1929, pp. xviii, 484.) The story of a developing civilization in the inhospitable borderlands of northern Scandinavia is of absorbing interest. This interest, however, is here obscured by a presentation that carries one from document to document rather than from period to period. Nowhere does the author properly summarize or interpret the facts he has painstakingly unearthed from the rich archives of government and Church. The compilation of facts gives a fairly thorough picture of governmental policy in the Lapp borderlands, though no picture of the whole colonizing movement.

The book is concerned chiefly with Umeå Lappmark, the southern part of Lapland. International politics were of less concern here than in the more northern Torneå and Kemi, but they were present. Soon after Gustavus Vasa (early sixteenth century) had detached Sweden from the hegemony of Denmark he instituted a stricter control in those districts inhabited only by Lapps and scattered hunters and fishers. He and his immediate successors were interested in pushing to the White Sea a wedge of Swedish territory which would prevent Russia and Denmark from encircling Sweden. Therefore Gustavus Adolphus and all farsighted rulers of Sweden attempted to befriend and assimilate the Lapps, who migrated back and forth with their valuable herds of reindeer. The state and state Church also combined to Christianize these northern nomads and made futile efforts to get them to settle in permanent communities. The government even attempted to prevent the forced labor which at the Nasa silver mines had killed many Lapps and reindeer and driven thousands across to Norway.

More dependable for defense and more productive of revenue for the crown would have been Swedish colonies in the northern woodlands. But the Lapps were far too valuable to be treated as were the American Indians. Therefore, while the government urged and encouraged colonization after 1590 it had numerous problems of reconciliation of interests between settlers and Lapps. This reconciliation the government tried to obtain chiefly through tax adjustments. It is in the treatment of taxation and the activity of the Church that this book is most thorough and most useful.

Colonization proceeded slowly but quite steadily. By 1700 the fishing and hunting homesteaders had turned to herding and agriculture, and were demanding a change in taxes-in-kind from fish to butter and other products. Along the coast the timber industry had created towns and a burgher class. Occupations were becoming differentiated, and settlers were encroaching more than ever on the Lapp fishing regions. By 1750 a definite boundary was necessary between Lappland and the colonized area, and it is at this point that Dr. Göthe leaves the story.

State Teachers College, Superior, Wisconsin. FRANKLIN D. SCOTT.

The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Age of Reaction and Reconstruction, 1815–1865. Edited by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A., LL. D., Fellow of King's College and Professor of Mediæval History in the University of London. [A Series of Lectures delivered at King's College, University of London, during the Session 1930–1931.] (London, George G. Harrap and Company, 1932, pp. 220, 8*s.* 6*d.*) This seventh volume in Professor Hearnshaw's series contains the following lectures: The Age of Reaction and Reconstruction, 1815–1865, by the Rev. Norman Sykes; Chateaubriand and the French Romantics, by Miss Maxwell; Hegel, the German Idealist, by A. D. Lindsay; Coleridge and the English Conservatives, by Keith Feiling; Robert Owen and the Early Socialists, by F. M. Page; John Stuart Mill and the Philosophic Radicals, by R. S. Dower; Auguste Comte and the Positivist Philosophers, by Theodora Bosanquet; John Austin and the Analytical Jurists, by the editor; and finally, Thomas Hodgskin and the Individualists, by C. H. Driver.

The currents of political and social thought in the first half of the nineteenth century have never been adequately studied from a European point of view. There was, in this period after Waterloo, a general European culture that cut across national frontiers, from Spain to Russia, marked by common conditions and by certain types of general ideology. There is thus a place for a work that relates the reactionaries, the liberals, and the radicals of the whole of Europe to each other. Dunning's attempt to do this in his *Political Theories from Rousseau to Spencer* is very disappointing because he handles the political thought of the period rather apart from the actual political and economic conditions of the time. Some of the histories of socialism and Ruggiero's *History of European Liberalism* are more successful though they deal only with limited schools of thought.

It was to be hoped that the work in hand would help to fill this gap. Instead, we find the currents of the time treated entirely in the terms of a few isolated "thinkers". Even the selection of these "thinkers" seems very arbitrary. Joseph de Maistre and Saint-Simon are not included, while Chateaubriand and Coleridge are. Throughout, the book is overbalanced on the English side. The best lectures are those on Owen, Austin, Hodgskin, and Mill, though they contain little that is not already easily available.

Oberlin College. FREDERICK B. ARTZ.

Sept Ans à l'Élysée avec le Président Émile Loubet: de l'Affaire Dreyfus à la Conférence d'Algésiras, 1899–1906. Par Abel Combarieu, ancien Secrétaire Général de la Présidence de la République. (Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1932, pp. x, 337, 30 fr.) M. Combarieu, President Loubet's secretary during his entire presidency, kept a journal, a large portion of which is reproduced in this volume. Letters, both official and private, and reports of conversa-

tions with M. Loubet appear in the journal, as well as the writer's own running commentary on the happenings of a most interesting period in the life of the Third Republic. As is natural, M. Combarieu looks at the drama from the point of view of the Élysée. One stands behind the scenes with him as the Dreyfus case, the struggle against clericalism and the monarchists, the Dual Alliance on the way to become the Triple Entente, and particularly the "fourberies" of Kaiser Wilhelm from the Boer War to the Algeçiras Conference add difficulty to difficulty, pile problem on problem, testing President Loubet's calmness, good nature, and sound judgment to the utmost. Inevitably, Waldeck-Rousseau is contrasted favorably with Combes, his successor in the premiership, whose persistent attacks on the Church embarrassed the president of the republic for three years.

It is interesting that the "legend" that Prince von Donnersmarck was sent on a special mission to Paris by the German government to demand the resignation of Delcassé is recorded as a fact, not as an invention. M. Jean Dupuy, who had lunched on May 11, 1905, with the prince, M. Rouvier, and other political personages, told Combarieu on that day of this demand of the Kaiser, who asked also for a cordial personal reception in France like that given to other sovereigns and the grant of the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor (p. 306).

Official visits to foreign sovereigns and visits by them to France play an important part in the narrative. As the companion of the president, M. Combarieu saw royalties at close hand and tells of their doings and their somewhat unexpected sayings. If one wishes to live again in those years of hate in France and diplomatic maneuvering in Europe, this entertaining journal may be recommended to the gossip lover—and also to the historian.

Princeton University. HENRY R. SHIPMAN.

Germany's Road to Ruin: the Middle Years of the Reign of the Emperor William II. By Karl Friedrich Nowak. Translated by E. W. Dickes. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. x, 382, $5.00.) There could be no justification for an extended review of Nowak's second volume in a serious historical journal, for the book simply cannot be classed as "serious" history. The volume at hand, following upon the author's earlier *Kaiser and Chancellor,* carries the story from Bismarck's dismissal in 1890 to the end of the first Moroccan crisis. Once again the author assures us that he has made extensive use not only of published materials, but of information vouchsafed him by William II. and numerous German statesmen, to say nothing of the "eminent British statesman" who appears for the first time and plays a prominent rôle in the author's explanatory notes. It is quite clear, however, that the writer has used only such materials as may have suited him, that the "eminent British statesman" was weak in knowledge or in memory, and

that the backbone of the book is the account given by William II. of his stewardship. Those familiar with the former emperor's own memoirs will not derive much new information from Nowak. The account of the non-renewal of the Reinsurance Treaty, of the Kruger telegram, of the Moroccan crisis, is the emperor's account, warmed up and modified here and there to take note of unanswerable evidence that could not be evaded. In the author's first volume the Iron Chancellor was the scapegoat. In this new book the responsibility is divided between Baron von Holstein and Prince von Bülow. In either case the ruler was the person wronged. We are assured over and over again that his intentions were good and his instincts correct. His efforts to reach an agreement with England were systematically frustrated, and when finally he turned in despair to Russia and concluded the Björkö Treaty he was obliged once more to see his whole work undone. No one will deny that a case can be made for William II., especially so far as the Morocco affair is concerned, but this book is inaccurate, prejudiced, and in some instances venomous (see not only the unkind analysis of Bülow's character, but particularly the almost indecent and utterly misleading biographical sketch of Edward VII.). The book, like Bülow's memoirs, makes good light reading, but from the historian's standpoint it is well-nigh worthless.

W. L. L.

Regulating an Industry: the Rhenish-Westphalian Coal Syndicate, 1893–1929. By Archibald H. Stockder, Associate Professor of Business Administration, Columbia University. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. xii, 159, $2.50.) This is a good case study of a regulated industry. Although it deals with a German organization it is not without clinical hints for treating one of America's worst afflicted branches of production. Coal mining is suffering from a world blight for which there is no local cure. But thirty-six years experience of the Rhenish-Westphalian coal syndicate, studied and analyzed as thoroughly as it has been in Germany and presented in a compact and competent summary like the present volume, promises valuable guidance to those who eventually will have to bring order out of our own anarchic situation. The author records many failures in detail, but they are redeemed by sufficient success on the whole to explain why organized control has persisted in Germany's most important colliery region through the vicissitudes of war, revolution, foreign occupation, and the present world crisis. The devices and policies which he describes for controlling production, regulating distribution and prices, and administering labor, were developed by a process of trial and error. They have not resulted in monopoly, and they have not reached their final form. They represent an historical movement, sketched as such in an introductory chapter, which forms part

of the larger picture of Germany's evolution during a critical period of her existence.

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

Die Jugoslawische Frage und die Julikrise, 1914. Von Ernst Anrich. [Beiträge zur Geschichte der Nachbismarckischen Zeit und des Weltkrieges, herausgegeben von Professor Dr. Fritz Kern in Bonn, Heft 12.] (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1931, pp. 166, 7.80 M.) The purpose of this little book is to describe the Balkan policies of the different European powers and show how they culminated in the conflict of 1914. The method used, parallel descriptions of these policies, points all the material toward the Balkans in 1914. To estimate the success of the author in applying such a method to this subject, as every intellectually honest reviewer must, is not difficult. The method is too elaborate for the amount of material; it exaggerates the importance of the Balkan question unduly by concentrating everything geometrically and by weight and volume. The account of Austrian policy is excellent, in that it explains the internal conditions which produced the "foreign" policy, albeit with a slight and unnecessary touch of apology. The style suffers from an excess of geo-political jargon leading the author in one place (p. 116) to criticize German diplomacy for its lack of "physical contact-feeling with the periphery"—meaning that Germany did not understand the internal-external problems of her ally. There is no index, the bibliography is incomplete, but the translations are accurate.

The University of Missouri. M. H. COCHRAN.

The Partition of Turkey: a Diplomatic History, 1913–1923. By Harry N. Howard. (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1931, pp. 486, $5.00.) Dr. Howard attacks in this book a problem of great interest, which nevertheless must be handled with much care, on account of the multiplicity of the nationalistic forces involved, and the complexity of their interactions. Each important step in the dissolution of the Ottoman empire has been accompanied by a wide international upheaval, including one or more wars and vast nebulæ of diplomatic negotiations. The latest crisis was by far the greatest of all. The records of five wars, one of them the climacteric in human history, and many thousand conversations and dispatches, with scores of projects, agreements, and treaties, fill archives to bursting and bring historians to exhaustion. Given a task whose perfection is perhaps impossible, Dr. Howard has labored at it mightily; witness his twenty-one pages of "Selected Bibliography", and his ninety-three pages of "Chapter Notes".

He narrates briefly the events of 1908–1913, which involved already no small amount of partition of Turkey. Early in 1915 came the demand of Russia to fulfill her age-long desire for Constantinople and the Straits. Then in 1916 England and France, admitting Russia and Italy, planned a

nearly complete partition of Arab- and Turkish-speaking lands, not without an eye upon Persia. After fierce debates at the Paris Peace Conference, a plan emerged in 1920 in the Treaty of Sèvres, which, while it fell short of the complete destruction contemplated before the Russian Revolution, nevertheless visaged a Turkey mutilated beyond hope and fettered irremediably by military and financial bonds. The false move of introducing Greek control in Smyrna led to three years of war between Turkey and Greece, which ended in victory for Turkey. Thereafter shrewd diplomats fought out at Lausanne a settlement final until now, which drew boundaries in a viable and hopefully permanent form, thus bringing to an end the partition of Turkey in its latest phase.

Dr. Howard's style is direct and clear. A great number of significant details are involved, demanding at times close attention from the reader, who is always well repaid by the illuminating result. The many characters concerned—rulers, statesmen, generals, and diplomats—are well introduced and clearly discriminated as regards their aims and achievements. The maps are clear. The map of the Turkish Republic, however, is neither up-to-date nor quite accurate in its display of completed and projected railways.

The University of Illinois. ALBERT HOWE LYBYER.

The Pilgrim Fathers from a Dutch Point of View. By D. Plooij, D.D., Professor in Amsterdam University. [Anson G. Phelps Lectureship on Early American History, New York University.] (New York, New York University Press, 1932, pp. xi, 154, $3.50.) This small volume by a learned professor of Amsterdam University contains the Phelps Lectures delivered at New York University in 1931–1932 in commemoration of the tercentenary of the Dutch Reformed Church in America and is dedicated to Amsterdam University in honor of its own tercentenary. Dr. Plooij has discharged his duties gracefully and at the same time has seriously given a scholarly résumé of new documents which he fortunately discovered in Holland. In conjunction with J. R. Harris he had already published *Leyden Documents relating to the Pilgrim Fathers* (1920) and, with Mr. Harris and S. K. Jones, *The Pilgrim Press* (1922), and these new papers he has summarized in two of his chapters. The last three are devoted to a scholarly discussion of the newly discovered letters and papers of the Rev. Hugh Goodyear, minister of the English Reformed Church at Leiden, 1617–1661, found by Dr. Plooij in the archives at Leiden and now printed for the first time. Certainly, in total these are the most numerous and interesting additional documents upon the Pilgrims to come to light in a long time, and yet it must be added that they are interesting rather than important and serve to illustrate and expand what we already knew sufficiently well rather than to change any salient features of the narrative or our estimate of the Pilgrims. They prove a more

sustained interest of the Pilgrims and of the Boston Puritans in those still at Leiden after the death of Robinson and the final migration to Plymouth than had been hitherto possible to demonstrate. Dr. Plooij is also convinced that the relations of the Pilgrim church at Leiden with the other English churches were always more cordial than has been thought. While mostly business documents concerned with property at Leiden owned by the Mastersons already at Plymouth, the papers do give a good deal of new information about the lesser known people at Plymouth, especially the Mastersons and the Rev. Ralph Smith. There also came to light a letter from Hugh Peters at Salem introducing to the Rev. Mr. Goodyear the first American student at Leiden, Francis Higginson, sent over in 1639.

Washington University. ROLAND G. USHER.

Bibliotheca Americana: Catalogue of the John Carter Brown Library in Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. Volume III: *1659–1674.* (Providence, Published by the Library, 1931, pp. 310.) During the entire period to 1800 to be covered by the *Catalogue,* there are many irregularities in the make-up of books due to more or less primitive printing and publishing conditions. Aside from the incunabula period from the 1450s to 1500, the output of printed books and pamphlets has only been partially recorded in bibliographies and catalogues. The third volume of the *John Carter Brown Catalogue* is a substantial contribution towards the charting of bibliographical terra incognita. To this end, the titles and imprints are transcribed fully and carefully; physical make-up is indicated both by pages and by signature marks; and extended notes about contents and authorship, with references to bibliographical and critical literature, are frequent. Undoubtedly the larger and less detailed general catalogues of printed books for the British Museum and for the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris are more widely known and used. Yet the *John Carter Brown Catalogue* covering books relating principally to the Americas and printed before 1800 seems much more useful within its limited field.

The Library of Congress. J. B. CHILDS.

A Social History of the Sea Islands, with Special Reference to St. Helena Island, South Carolina. By Guion Griffis Johnson. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1930, pp. vii, 245, $3.00.) This is a rather pedestrian study of the sea-island economy and culture, from the period of English, French, and Spanish rivalry in the sixteenth century, to the 1880s, with some passing references to later events. In arrangement a combination of chronological and topical treatment, it suffers somewhat from having posed itself no questions to answer. No injustice is done the intrinsic interest of the subject, however, and the study was fully worth undertaking.

Probably the most interesting—because the most detailed—part of the book is the chapter devoted to the transition period of 1861–1866, the years during which various experiments for the rehabilitation of the slaves were undertaken by the War and Treasury departments and by philanthropic individuals. Like the larger endeavors of the Freedmen's Bureau, these experiments were a mixture of much genuine common sense, some rascality, and a dash of utopianism. They were hampered, as was the Freedmen's Bureau, by a cumbrous bureaucracy, a miscellaneous personnel, and—strange as it may sound—a fundamental conservatism in economic matters. Unlike the Freedmen's Bureau, they had an almost uniformly backward group of Negroes to deal with.

Various interesting conclusions emerge from the author's treatment of the ante bellum period. The sea-island slave economy was notably inefficient and speculative. The slave himself was less assimilated to white standards than his mainland brother because of the smallness of the white population to set him an example. On the other hand, certain features of slave social life that grew out of the "peculiar institution" itself, developed on the sea islands as elsewhere—*e.g.*, the drawing of caste lines between the various grades of slaves, and the matriarchal tendency of the slave family. On the white side, the essentially frontier quality of sea-island life must strike the reader. The hunts, the clubs, the books, the hospitality of the plantation owner, his recourse to more or less distant centers for the recovery of his health, for social intercourse for his family, for education for his children—all this recalls, not the frontier of the American West, to be sure, but that of the Englishman in South Africa or India, where certain elements of "culture" are superimposed by a small ruling class upon life in an outpost of civilization. One wonders how far this was true of the Old South as a whole.

Washington, D. C. PAUL LEWINSON.

Laboring and Dependent Classes in Colonial America, 1607–1783: Studies of the Economic, Educational, and Social Significance of Slaves, Servants, Apprentices, and Poor Folk. By Marcus Wilson Jernegan, Professor of American History, University of Chicago. [University of Chicago Social Service Monographs, no. 17.] (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1931, pp. xiii, 256, $3.00.) All of these thirteen studies have previously appeared in periodicals, two of them in this review. They are reprinted with few changes. Students of colonial society and of early American education would have welcomed from the author a further exercise of his meticulous method in the analysis of new materials, and in particular an extension of his studies from the New England and Southern colonies, here chiefly observed, to the middle group. But it is useful, meanwhile, to have gathered between two covers a group of related essays which represent at many points the fundamental investigations in their field.

Despite the elaborate title the scope of the volume calls for a clearer definition. The economic aspect of colonial labor comes into view only in relation to indenture and, especially, slavery. Conversely, it is the educational rather than the industrial character of apprenticeship which is emphasized in the group of essays which comprise the heart of the collection. Again, free laborers are excluded except as poverty threw such folk upon the public agencies for poor relief. Those agencies as they existed in New England and Virginia are exhibited in ample detail, against the background of the English poor law.

V. W. C.

William Byrd of Westover. By Richmond Croom Beatty. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932, pp. xxi, 233, $3.00.) William Byrd's imagination, his keen though easily slaked thirst for knowledge of the mysteries of Virginia and its environs, and the literary grace that made him preëminent among men of letters in colonial Virginia, are not reflected in this careful, unprejudiced, though less than complete biography. Most of the obvious sources have been used with fidelity but there are grave omissions. The *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, 1654–1717,* is not cited, nor has the author used the mass of transcripts from British archives in the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress. There is partial atonement in the use of the abstracts in the Virginia State Library. Other collections, such as the Byrd papers in the Huntington Library, have not been consulted. The *Neu-gefundenes Eden,* containing Eine kurtze Beschreibung von Virginia (von William Byrd; übersetzt von S. Jenner), is also omitted. A more detailed study of the character and interests of the elder William Byrd from available sources would lead to a better understanding of the background of the son.

More of Virginia history and less grasping in the realm of probability would give substance to this sketch of Byrd. His contemporaries, Sir John Randolph, John Custis, Micajah Perry, his English friends, are mere names and their significant contacts do not help in giving life to his picture. The finality of some of the author's verdicts do not give the muse of history due merit as a whimsical mistress. Letters that are known to exist, though not yet in print, would indicate that Byrd was not completely forgotten by his friends, the Southwells, as is stated. In interpreting the joust for power between Byrd and Spotswood the writer is impartial and discerning. But, here, too, the spade must dig deeper before the tangle is fully uprooted. Several theories advanced to explain Byrd's reactions might be subjected to further examination. Is Byrd's restlessness in Virginia unduly stressed?

The biography under consideration avoids the temptation to picture this romantic figure as popular tradition has preserved him rather than as critically used sources reveal him. It does not meet the need for a more com-

plete study than that by the late Professor Bassett in his brief introduction to his edition of Byrd's *Writings*.

The University of Richmond. MAUDE H. WOODFIN.

The Vestry Book of Stratton Major Parish, King and Queen County, Virginia, 1729–1783. Transcribed, annotated, and indexed by C. G. Chamberlayne. (Richmond, the Library Board, 1931, pp. xxi, 257, $5.00.) This is the thirteenth parish record book of Virginia to be published of the forty-odd known to be extant. Commencing with the *Vestry Book of Henrico Parish, 1730–1773* (1874), the number of printed volumes has increased one each year since 1927, and it is hoped that the Library Board can carry out its plan, herewith begun, of making the rest of these priceless records accessible in printed form.

The matter-of-fact account of parish routine, much of which is taken for granted in the recording, reminds one that the clerk was not writing for an outside audience, nor presupposing that any later historian would wish for more detail. There are the periodic expense accounts of the parish, the annual levy, the processioning of land, the works of charity—all revealing directly or indirectly the social and economic life of the community. The erection of a new church during the decade preceding the Revolution indicates a period of growing prosperity. Most valuable in this connection are specifications for the building and a list of the allotment of pews to various families, the women being segregated. Like so many contemporary local records, this vestry book contains no mention of the American Revolution.

It should be noted that the original manuscript vestry book, in the Episcopal Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia, when the copy went to press, has since been transferred to the Virginia State Library where it is on deposit, along with other parish records from the seminary. The present printed record is well edited, with four facsimile pages and three indexes: by names of persons, geographic, and topical.

The University of Virginia. LESTER J. CAPPON.

The George Washington Atlas. Edited by Lawrence Martin, Chief, Division of Maps, Library of Congress. [George Washington Bicentennial Commission.] (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1932, 50 plates, $2.00.) Colonel Martin's handsome atlas enables one to trace George Washington's changing interests and activities. In youth he learned surveying, but where and from whom is still a mystery. Possibly his very busy father taught him, and, marking his aptitude, left George his own surveying instruments. Augustine Washington died in 1743, when George was eleven years old. The first survey in Colonel Martin's atlas, dated 1747, is tentatively located at Bridges Creek, Washington's birthplace. From George's copy-

books, dated by him in 1746, we know that at the age of fourteen he had learned geometry and had begun to make surveys for his cousins. He was sixteen when he laid out the town of Alexandria, two plats of which are given. He was then living at Mount Vernon, playing whist with his sister-in-law and loo with his brother, besides surveying the latter's turnip field. In March, 1748, under James Genn, he began surveying in the Blue Ridge for Lord Fairfax; and the next year was busily employed surveying lands in Augusta County for various settlers. From 1750 to 1752, he surveyed thirty-two tracts in Frederick County (now West Virginia), including two for his brother Lawrence, whose heir he became in 1752. In 1753, George Washington began his military career, and turned to drawing fortifications. His later surveying was done for himself on his own lands in Virginia and continued until the last months of his life. There are various maps relating to the Revolution, and to Washington's western lands, and his various journeyings are traced. By one of those errors Washington seldom makes, he called Dogue Creek, Pohick Creek, as one may see by the location of his mills, now being rebuilt. A considerable number of the maps came to Colonel Martin after the intention to publish the atlas was announced. It is to be hoped that many more will be called out of hiding by the publication, including the long lost plat of a town in Pennsylvania which disappeared about forty years ago.

As a Washington document, this atlas stands in the first rank.

Washington, D. C. CHARLES MOORE.

Letters and Papers of Major-General John Sullivan, Continental Army. Edited by Otis G. Hammond, Director of the New Hampshire Historical Society. Volume II., 1778–1779. [Collections of the New Hampshire Historical Society, volume XIV.] (Concord, New Hampshire Historical Society, 1931, pp. xxvi, 577, $10.00.) It has been aptly said of General Sullivan that he passed through "a cloud not of war only, but detractions rude". In an illuminating introduction, the editor shows how the present volume, like its predecessor, readily disposes of the aspersions cast upon the fair name of this son of New Hampshire by some of the early writers on the Revolution. The papers here collected relate chiefly to Sullivan's career in Rhode Island in 1778. The strategic and administrative problems which confronted him in that theater of operations were only surpassed in difficulty and complexity by those which he encountered in his campaign against the Tories and Indians in the following year. With but a small body of Continental troops to serve as a nucleus, he was obliged not only to raise an army but to provide for its provisioning, transportation, arming, and equipment. In doing this he had to deal with four separate groups of political authorities, those of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. In short, he was obliged to do on a small scale what Washington was doing

on a large scale. How, out of these circumstances, he created and conducted a fighting force which, except for a combination of events beyond his control, bade fair to capture Newport, the *Papers* reveal with enlightening detail. They also tend to confirm the correctness of the estimate of Sullivan by the first serious student of his career, T. C. Amory, whose *Life of John Sullivan* appeared in 1868.

Wellesley College. E. E. Curtis.

A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791–1884. By Peter Guilday. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. x, 291, $3.00.) The twelve legislative assemblies convened by church authority at Baltimore have an importance all their own in reference to the history of Catholicism in the United States. These significant gatherings began with a synod convoked by him whom Cardinal Gibbons was wont to style the father of the American Church, Bishop John Carroll, in 1791. While taking their name from one see, Baltimore, not only the three plenary councils, but the other nine as well, affected the Church throughout the entire country, and herein lies their principal interest for the historian. Every one of them was national in its influence. At the date of the first synod (1791), the diocese of Baltimore was coterminous with the nation. The assembly of 1810 was made up of bishops who all belonged to one province, the only province in the United States, the province of Baltimore; and the province of Baltimore remained the sole archiepiscopal jurisdiction of the United States down to the holding of the seventh provincial council in 1849.

Under an incompetent hand the rich content of these councils might easily have been obscured, for an attempt at their history would have resulted in little more than a mere linking together of texts of law. Such a presentation would have hidden their real import. For in reality they are a series of reflectors and determinants of the life of a rapidly growing social organism. The prelates who participated in them had to deal with practical conditions and urgent problems, and the decrees of the councils and the pastoral letters which followed them give us, as nothing else can, a record of the life and growth of the Catholic Church.

The councils of Baltimore, then, viewed rightly, are our best source-text of American Catholic Church history, and, as was to be expected, their true character has been ably developed by Dr. Guilday. One finishes the reading of this volume with a sense of thankfulness that this much-needed work comes from the pen of one who, through training and through previous related studies, has so fine a control of the field of American Church history, and especially one who fulfills Ortolan's requirement that every historian should be a jurist and every jurist a historian. The result of this happy coincidence in the present instance has been to give us not only an excellent

history of the councils of Baltimore, but also, concomitantly, the best history of the Catholic Church in the United States that has yet appeared.

Brookline, Massachusetts. JOHN T. CREAGH.

The Life and Times of Colonel Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky. By Leland Winfield Meyer, Ph. D. [Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, no. 359.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. 508, $5.50.) In this volume Dr. Meyer has presented a painstaking account of the life of a rather interesting figure in Kentucky and national politics of the early nineteenth century. With the usual start as a lawyer, Colonel Johnson entered the Kentucky legislature, was representative in Congress from 1804 to 1819, served in the Senate from the latter date until 1837, and was Vice President in the Van Buren administration. In 1841 he retired to private life, and in 1850 he was elected again to the Kentucky legislature a few months before his death. In the course of this long public service, Colonel Johnson won a reputation as an indefatigable worker, and became a man of some importance, although he scarcely ranks among the really important statesmen of the period. At first in harmony with Clay, he became a strong supporter of Jackson, although he was always a nationalist in such issues as internal improvements and the tariff. His chief title to fame comes from his military record at the head of his mounted regiment in Harrison's campaign into Canada in the War of 1812. It was Johnson's bold attack upon the main body of the Indians which won the final victory at the battle of the Thames, and from the extensive material given in this volume, it would seem that Johnson himself was the author of this daring plan.

Certainly Dr. Meyer has made the most of his subject, taking up each episode in which Colonel Johnson had a part with great detail, although he does not present any startlingly new viewpoints. The two chapters that give really fresh material deal with Colonel Johnson's personal life as a popular Kentucky politician and planter. He aided in the establishment of Choctaw Academy for the education of Indian youths, as well as of two Baptist educational institutions, Columbian College in Washington and Georgetown College in Kentucky. Throughout this volume Dr. Meyer has preserved an impartial attitude, with no attempt to gloss over certain obvious failings of his subject. The style is rather choppy, and many facts are stated, with a noticeable lack of the analysis necessary to carry the story. The research has been particularly exhaustive, and there are a multitude of footnotes which support every important fact. Certainly it is scarcely conceivable that any further material of importance can be unearthed with regard to Colonel Richard M. Johnson. Whether he was a sufficiently notable personage to justify so extensive a work is questionable.

The University of Cincinnati. BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

Herschel V. Johnson of Georgia, State Rights Unionist. By Percy Scott Flippin, Ph. D., Professor of History in Coker College. (Richmond, Dietz Printing Company, 1931, pp. xv, 336, $5.00.) Herschel V. Johnson prepared carefully for his future biographer. He wrote an autobiography, kept copies of many of his letters, collected such others as his friends had saved, and preserved numerous newspaper clippings and letters received. Some of these literary remains were destroyed during the Civil War, but the larger part have survived. A few years ago Professor Flippin was given access to this wealth of material and it has formed the chief source for this book.

In the crisis of 1860–1861 Johnson took a course which gained him the wholesale enmity of Southern Democrats and in preparing for his biographer he was interested principally in proving himself consistent in his political actions. Professor Flippin has followed his lead and has confined himself to the narrow limits of tracing the evolution of Johnson's political ideas. Taking the autobiography as his principal source he has printed large excerpts from it, has interspersed these selections with long quotations from Johnson's speeches and letters, and has bound them together with his own comments. From his footnotes it would appear that he has consulted little beyond the Johnson collection.

Johnson started life as a state rights Democrat who gave his allegiance to Calhoun in the struggle over the compromise of 1850. In 1860–1861 he consented to run for Vice President on the ticket with Douglas. The reason for his action in both cases was his belief in non-intervention. Neither the North, nor the South, he held, had any right to demand that the Federal government interfere in the territories in the matter of slavery either to prohibit it or even to protect it. The election of Lincoln, he maintained, was no just cause for the secession of Georgia and he joined his friend Alexander H. Stephens in opposing it. During the Civil War, he was a Confederate senator who, though he did not believe the South would win, tried to support Davis. Nevertheless the Confederate president and he seldom agreed, least of all on financial matters, for Johnson opposed the policy of inflation which proved so disastrous. He confined his opposition to Davis, however, to voting against him without denouncing him; he was not in a class with Brown and Vance. During Reconstruction he did his share in the battle against the carpetbagger and when white supremacy was restored, became a judge and labored to straighten out the legal tangles arising in the previous decade of confusion.

Within the narrow limits which the author has set for himself, the book is an informative contribution. But there is no effort toward setting forth the reasons for Johnson's influence or the nature of his constituency. His political life is described rather than explained.

The University of Pennsylvania. Roy F. Nichols.

The Cradle of the Queen City: a History of Buffalo to the Incorporation of the City. By Robert W. Bingham, Director of Museum, Buffalo Historical Society. [Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society, Volume XXXI.] (Buffalo, the Society, 1931, pp. 504, $5.00.) Mr. Bingham's attractively printed and beautifully illustrated volume is an effort to treat the history of Buffalo from its settlement to 1832 from the point of view of the historian rather than of the antiquary. Canadian and American manuscript collections and the extensive monographic studies of the Niagara frontier have been laid under contribution for this purpose. The chapters on the occupation of Fort Niagara and the attempt to control the Iroquois by the British, following the Treaty of Paris, yield new material of value drawn from the Haldimand Papers. In his account of the struggles between Buffalo and Black Rock for the western terminus of "Clinton's Ditch" the author gives us a vivid picture of the New York frontier in the 1820s. Full use is made of contemporary newspapers in the chapter on Taverns and Stage Lines, and considerable light is shed upon the modes of travel during the period.

Much in the book, however, is disappointing. The early chapters on the French and Indians are disconnected and episodic. In proportion the book seems, to the reviewer, to be unbalanced. Insignificant events are treated at great length, probably because the author was embarrassed by the richness of his new material; but one is hardly justified in quoting the twenty-four toasts offered at the celebration of the opening of the Erie Canal (pp. 439–441). The reader, upon closing the book, is left with a confused impression of the early history of the "Queen City", and will wish to go elsewhere for information about the everyday life of the village and for some account of its religious activities in connection with the eccentricities of the "burned-over district". A fondness for purple passages and clumsy circumlocution mars the directness of the narrative; and it were better to give no references at all, than to cite authorities merely by name. Notwithstanding these defects, Mr. Bingham's book is a contribution to a *genre* of historical writing which deserves the attention of scholars.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. CARL BRIDENBAUGH.

American Opinion on the Unification of Italy, 1846–1861. By Howard R. Marraro. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. xii, 345, $3.50.) Dr. Marraro has taken an excellent subject. The reaction of public opinion in the United States to the events of the Risorgimento produced no serious diplomatic effect, and, as Dr. Marraro shows, had no influence on the course of those events beyond producing the dispatch of resolutions and some voluntary contributions of money and arms, in behalf both of the patriotic cause and of the embattled Church. But it affords the opportunity for a most interesting contribution to the study of the ways in which one

nation forms its picture of another, and of the forces in this country active between 1846 and 1861 in coloring the American picture of Italy.

If the present study is disappointing, this result would seem to be due at bottom to the author's failure to keep his mind focused on such an objective and to appreciate the difficulties that beset his undertaking. Relying chiefly on papers published in New York, as he was justified in doing, Dr. Marraro has resorted to the method of sampling, and has made a compilation of news and editorials covering events in Italy from these and a few other widely scattered journals. But his analysis of this material leaves everything to be desired. He makes no attempt to qualify his journalistic witnesses—a measure of particular importance in the circumstances of that period of turbulent, competitive, and intensely personal pioneering in the American newspaper world. Furthermore, his selection of "sample" papers awakens a doubt if the author appreciated the fundamental divisions of American opinion in his period, for, excepting the New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* which reflected the opinions of a commercial center, and the Richmond *Daily Examiner* for a single year (1861), the then dominant South, whose reactions might have been found in the Richmond *Enquirer,* the Charleston *Mercury,* or De Bow's *Review,* is entirely neglected.

Besides newspapers the author uses the letters and other writings of American observers in Italy. But his use of them again raises the question whether he has clearly defined his problem. Is it their contents that is important, as characteristic of an American reaction, or their influence? If the latter, the author is hardly justified—to take a single example—in quoting for events at Naples in 1851 letters of G. P. Marsh which were not published in the United States until 1888. If the former, we want to know more about the witness. Against errors in the American version of the Risorgimento Dr. Marraro makes no effort to warn the reader unfamiliar with the Italian movement. To take only one example from many, the New York *Herald's* report of Cavour's address to the Congress of Paris is given (p. 199) as if it represented Cavour's actual words.

It should be added, however, that Dr. Marraro writes vigorously and well, and has brought together material that will be valuable for further studies of American public opinion.

The John Hopkins University. KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

Mrs. Abraham Lincoln: a Study of her Personality and her Influence on Lincoln. By W. A. Evans, M.S., M.D. (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1932, pp. viii, 364, xiii, $4.00.) For anyone who wishes to review the evidence that Mrs. Lincoln was an abnormal person predisposed to insanity, this book will form interesting, if somewhat dreary, reading. Dr. Evans seems to have no thesis but a professional one. He is annoyed by the popular stories about Mrs. Lincoln; he regards her as an unfortunate and, at least in

her late years, an irresponsible woman; he has set out to tell her story as a medical case, to tell it with all the exactness and fullness which the documents permit. The layman can hardly see what is left to say.

N. W. S.

The United States since 1865. By Louis M. Hacker, Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, and Benjamin B. Kendrick, Women's College of the University of North Carolina. [Crofts American History Series, Dixon Ryan Fox, General Editor.] (New York, F. S. Crofts and Company, 1932, pp. xx, 775, $5.00.) To the rapidly growing number of textbooks on the recent period of American history may be added this extensive treatise—a contribution featuring a comprehensive analysis of American civilization, recommended to the public as well as to the understanding student; a product with an attractive style—forceful, vigorous, and at times critically ironic. The work is largely that of Mr. Hacker, "a journalist and working economist", with Professor Kendrick having written the chapter on the Civil War and its immediate aftermath, and counseled revisions throughout the rest of the book.

Two major themes constitute the framework: "The Humbling of the Farmers" and "The Emergence of Imperial America". One is impressed with the organizing skill of the authors; the scheme of chapters makes the volume one of ready reference to almost any subject. There are many citations in the narrative to recent authorities, their specific contributions, and interpretations. The fact that many of the chapters fairly bristle with details will cause many teachers to feel that the work is a compendium of facts and hence unsuitable for textbook purposes.

The authors present the best account of the 1920s yet available, concluding with a discussion of the present depression and a suggestive program for the future. A severe indictment of Harding's administration (p. 548), as well as uncomplimentary remarks on Coolidge, Hoover, and Mellon open the work to the charge that there are too many opinionated statements and thus not sufficient judicial impartiality. At times too much attention is devoted to the economics of particular problems and to legislation never passed by Congress.

The value of the book is greatly enhanced by a number of useful maps and tables, a serviceable index, and an extensive up-to-date bibliography arranged according to chapters. The numerous short biographical sketches are highly commendable. There are very few errors of fact. One may conclude that the volume is a valuable interpretation of recent American history.

Western Reserve University. Roy Marvin Robbins.

The Religious Aspects of Swedish Immigration: a Study of Immigrant Churches. By George M. Stephenson, Associate Professor of History, Uni-

versity of Minnesota. (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1932, pp. viii, 542, $4.50.) The religious experience of the Swedes in America is centered about the Augustana Synod. More than among other Protestant immigrant groups unity has been preserved in religious organization. It is a natural tendency for migrating churches to be afflicted with heresies and torn by schisms. The story of the migration of the Swedish religious institutions and their development in the American environment is the theme of Professor Stephenson's study.

The seeds of nonconformity had been sown in Sweden. Within the established Church the Läsare movement produced many lay ministers; "Eric Jansonism" aroused interest in the religious freedom prevailing across the Atlantic; Baptists, Methodists, Mission Friends, and Mormons organized congregations. When the immigrants arrived in America, although the great majority of them had previously maintained a nominal connection with the Swedish State Church, the inherent centrifugal tendencies and the active proselyting of American Home Mission boards led to the formation of numerous synods of the Lutheran faith and conferences of other denominations. But the early Swedish Lutheran Church in America possessed leaders of strong personality such as T. N. Hasselquist, and O. Olsson, and their efforts and influence held the majority together.

"The political sagacity of the devil is seen at its best, or worst, in controversies between religious organizations", writes Professor Stephenson. Fortunately he deals with these controversies only in so far as is necessary for an understanding of the religious trends, and when it is advisable to sit in judgment the opinion is expressed with fairness and good humor. The book is more than the title suggests. Not only religious policy, but all the conditions that shaped that policy are described. There are admirable discussions of the cause and course of Swedish migration, of the community life in the Swedish settlements, and of the educational institutions and journalistic ventures that the Augustana Synod and other ecclesiastical organizations founded. The last chapters are concerned with the process of Americanization, the relations with the established Church of Sweden and the thorny "language problem".

This volume can be read with profit by many whose primary interest is not in Swedish-American affairs. The historian sees lived over again episodes which are usually considered peculiar to the religious life of the colonial period. When a dozen similar investigations have been made, some general principles will be revealed and, then, what was happening in seventeenth century New England will be viewed in a more historical perspective, as the normal experience of an ecclesiastical establishment planted in the New World.

The extensive bibliography calls for special commendation.

The University of Illinois. MARCUS L. HANSEN.

History of the United States. By Asa Earl Martin, Ph.D., Professor of American History in the Pennsylvania State College. Volume II., 1865–1931. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1931, pp. xiii, 811, $3.80.) In this second volume of his *History of the United States,* which is a textbook designed for college use, Professor Martin follows the plan of organization which he adopted in the first part of his work. Although the chronological arrangement of material forms the basis of his narrative, he does not hesitate to depart from it when some topic requires special emphasis. In apportioning space he has selected the beginning of Theodore Roosevelt's administration as the halfway point in American development since the Civil War. There are few instances of misplaced emphasis, but the eighty pages devoted to the political aspects of the Reconstruction era might well have been abbreviated.

Professor Martin has obviously followed the best secondary works available and his interpretations and judgments are consequently seldom open to serious challenge. Occasionally, however, he fails to make his point clear. For example, the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Wabash Railroad *v.* Illinois (1886) was important not because "the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce was definitely recognized", but rather because the power of the states to regulate interstate commerce was specifically denied and their jurisdiction was limited to intra-state commerce (p. 141). Or again, the implications of "government by injunction" are not well presented in the discussion of the Pullman strike of 1894 (p. 321). Nor does the explanation of our recent Caribbean policy contain a clear picture of the less heroic side of our intervention in Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua (pp. 548–554).

The most satisfactory sections in the volume are those dealing with the period following the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson. Here the author is happy in his selection of material and convincing in his arrangement and presentation of it. Personal observation has not been for him "a treacherous chart" of the important events of his own day. Especially worthy of praise are the paragraphs which contain an appraisal of the effect of the World War upon the movement for international peace and an analysis of the progress which the nations have made during the last decade toward a new order based upon a community of economic interest.

Columbia University. JOHN A. KROUT.

Race, Class, and Party: a History of Negro Suffrage and White Politics in the South. By Paul Lewinson. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1932, pp. x, 302, $3.75.) Four years ago an article in this *Review* (XXXIV. 31) expounded the thesis that the central theme in the history of the South is that that region "shall be and remain a white man's country". The present volume deals with the functioning of this Southern determina-

tion by considering to what extent the Negro has at different times voted, and how white politics has been influenced by the persistent attempt to exclude the Negro from the polls.

The book is evenly divided into three parts. In the first, a summary of the period ending with the disfranchising constitutions of 1890–1910, the student of American history will find little new material. There is, however, some departure from the usual viewpoint, for attention is focused upon the Negro and his influence in politics.

The second and more valuable part of the book brings the story to 1930. Using newspaper accounts, interviews, questionnaires, and other sources, estimates are cautiously made of the slight extent to which Negroes now vote in Southern primaries and elections, and suggestions are ventured as to the results of this condition on the Negroes' economic and social status. We are also reminded that the white man's struggle to maintain control in the South has had marked effects on white politics. In the future these may become more pronounced. For instance, it is entirely possible that the electoral restrictions now used by white man against black may be used, when the occasion seems to demand it, by white man against white man. As to the future of Negro suffrage, the author wisely refrains from prophecy, but he points out the roads along which changes, if any, are most likely to come. In this connection it is significant that in several of the instances where the Negro vote counts in the South—even in a Democratic primary—the door has been opened, not by "black Republicans", but by Southern white men who prefer to have a few Negroes vote than to lose a bitterly fought election.

The last third of the book contains an exposition of the questionnaire used, registration statistics, and election laws, together with citations, the bibliography, and the index. In the summary of the election laws there is no mention of the "electoral votes" device of Mississippi (Constitution of 1890, sections 140, 143), which is an important guarantee of white political supremacy in that state.

The University of Mississippi. CHARLES S. SYDNOR.

Bryan and World Peace. By Merle Eugene Curti. [Smith College Studies in History, volume XVI., nos. 3–4.] (Northampton, pp. 113–260, $1.50.) An important contribution is made by this study to a full-length portrait of William Jennings Bryan, as well as to the literature of pacifism. The idealist here valiantly confronts a world that scorns his patterns, in a conflict wherein evolution is apparent. In the Spanish War, the subject's inconsistencies are glaring; in the World War, he is a more attractive figure, sacrificing place and power for principle. While between these heroic episodes, he renders his most enduring service to world peace, the so-called

thirty treaties of arbitration. Had there been a thirty-first, with Germany, what might the world have been?

The author preserves throughout a well sustained detachment. Frankly pacific, he finds much to praise and much to blame in Bryan, but concludes that Bryan's failure was inseparable from divided loyalties—to nationalism, to private property, even to imperialism at times, to Woodrow Wilson personally—some or all of which were incompatible with a love for peace.

The theme is so profound, the character so interesting, the author so competent to his task, that the reader cannot fail of being stimulated. He will discover unsuspected depths in Bryan, unimagined possibilities of pacifism, and a fresh avenue of approach to the most recent "tragic era".

Purdue University. Louis Martin Sears.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Presidential Address delivered on December 28 at the annual meeting of the Association in Toronto will be printed in the April number of the *Review*.

The twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch was held at Occidental College, Los Angeles, on December 29 and 30. The program included sessions on European history, on the Indians of the American Southwest, the Pacific Area, and a session on the George Washington Bicentennial when Mr. Rupert Hughes read a paper on Pitfalls of a Biographer. Dr. Max Farrand addressed the luncheon session on December 29, and Professor Edward M. Hulme gave the presidential address on that evening.

The second volume of the Report of the Commission on the Social Studies is *An Introduction to the History of the Social Sciences in Schools,* by Professor Henry Johnson, of Teachers College, Columbia University (Scribner's, pp. vi, 145).[1]

Volume II., number 1, and the first two volumes of cumulative indexes of this journal are in demand, and persons with copies for sale are requested to communicate with the office of the Association.

PERSONAL

John Merlin Powis Smith, professor of Semitic languages and literature at the University of Chicago, died on September 26 at the age of 65. He was noted as an Old Testament scholar and was interested in Oriental research. He was born in England, but was educated in this country, receiving his doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1899. In that year his teaching service at the university began. His professorship dated from 1915.

William Templeton Waugh, professor of history at McGill University, died on October 17 at the age of 48. Professor Waugh was born in Manchester, England, and received the master of arts degree at the University of Manchester. In that university he began his work as a teacher. From 1915 to 1918 he was acting professor of history at Queen's University, Belfast, returning in 1919 to Manchester as reader in history. In 1922 he was appointed associate professor at McGill University, becoming Kingsford Professor of History three years later. His best known work was *James Wolfe, Man and*

[1] Books and articles mentioned in this and the following sections appeared in 1932 unless a date is given.

Soldier (Montreal, 1928; reviewed here, XXXVI. 578). He also completed vol. III. of James Hamilton Wylie's *The Reign of Henry the Fifth* (1929; reviewed here, XXXV. 653) from manuscript material left at the death of the author. He wrote two of the best chapters in the latest volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History*.

Clarence Monroe Burton of Detroit died on October 23 at the age of 79. After having been graduated from the Law School of the University of Michigan in 1874, he became a clerk in a Detroit law firm. Here his attention became diverted to real estate and the drawing of abstracts with which his later career became identified. He early achieved substantial success in his calling, and for almost half a century was accounted a foremost citizen of Detroit and Michigan. He made the pursuit of history his life-time avocation, and in this connection became one of America's notable collectors. The zeal he displayed as a collector was fairly matched by his generosity in sharing his treasures with others. The logical climax of this altruism was the gift, in 1914, of his entire library of Americana to the Detroit Public Library, which was organized as the Burton Historical Collection. Based on Detroit as its center, the collection deals with the Northwest and with Canada and the states of the older East, from which the Northwest has evolved. It numbers some 65,000 catalogued books and pamphlets, several hundred bound volumes of newspapers, hundreds of scrapbooks, 3000 maps, and 9000 prints. It includes one of the largest genealogical libraries in the country, and scores of thousands of manuscripts. For the study of Michigan history it is indispensable, for the wider area to which Michigan belongs, it constitutes a useful, and frequently invaluable historical laboratory. As a department of the Public Library, its individual resources are supplemented by the more general, and far more extensive, resources of that institution. One of the outstanding historical workshops of the interior of the country, the collection is but the lengthened shadow of its creator. M. M. Q.

Edvard Bull, professor of history at the University of Oslo, died on August 26, at the age of 51. His special field was the medieval period in Norse history, but he took an active part in contemporary politics as a leader of the Norwegian Labor party. Aside from numerous shorter studies and articles, he edited the new coöperative history of Norway (*Det Norske Folks Liv og Historie*) which is now appearing. A follower of Karl Marx, to whom he devoted a small volume, one met in him on every hand—to quote the comment of his colleague, Professor Halvdan Koht—clear thought combined with a severe critique of the sources for his works. H. L.

Ernst Mayer, professor of the history of law in the University of Würzburg, died at the close of summer at the age of 70. Among his published works are *Deutsche und Französische Verfassungsgeschichte vom 9. zum 14. Jahrhundert*, 2 vols. (1899), and *Italienische Verfassungsgeschichte von der Gothenzeit zur Zunftherrschaft*, 2 vols. (1909).

Solomon Reinach, the eminent archæologist and director of the National Museum of Antiquities at St. Germain-en-Laye, died on November 4 at the age of 74. As a brilliant and productive scholar his achievements were astonishing in quality and compass. His published volumes number more than seventy. The most notable were: *Répertoire de la Statuaire Grecque et Romaine*, 4 vols. (1897–1910); *Répertoire de Vases Grecs et Étrusques*, 2 vols. (1899–1900); and *Répertoire de Peinture du Moyen Age et de la Renaissance, 1280–1580*, 5 vols. (1905–1922).

At a meeting of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, held on November 14, Dr. Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer delivered an address on the late John Bach McMaster. It will be published in the *Proceedings* of the society.

A sketch of the late Carl Russell Fish, by Dr. Joseph Schafer, appears in the September number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*.

Dr. Louise P. Kellogg gives an illuminating interpretation of the late Professor Turner's work as a teacher in an article in the *Historical Outlook* for October, entitled The Passing of a Great Teacher: Frederick Jackson Turner. It is an account of personal experience as a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin.

The late Albert Mathiez is the subject of an appreciative article by the Rev. J. M. Thompson in the October number of the *English Historical Review*. A bibliography of his writings, listing 600 items, appeared in the January issue of the *Boletín del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas*. It was prepared by Sr. Ricardo R. Caillet-Bois, secretary of the institute, which is in Buenos Aires. It will be recalled that Professor Mathiez visited the Argentine a few years ago, delivering a course of lectures.

An account of the life and work of the late Professor M. N. Pokrovsky, the leading historian of Soviet Russia, is given by Professor Otto Hoetzsch in the *Zeitschrift für Osteuropäische Geschichte* (1932, Heft 4).

Edward Léon Harvey, recently of the California Institute of Technology and visiting scholar at the Henry E. Huntington Library, is acting as professorial lecturer at Western Reserve University during the absence of Robert C. Binkley, who is on leave at Harvard University.

Philip Ainsworth Means, whose *Fall of the Inca Empire* has recently appeared, is in Europe collecting material for a work on Civilizations of Northern, Eastern, and Southern South America.

Dr. James F. Kenney, of the public archives of Canada, has received from the Aonach Tailteann [Irish Olympic Games] of 1932 an award recognizing his work entitled *The Sources of Early Irish History* as the "most important contribution to scholarship on the part of one of Irish descent in the period 1926–1931".

The *Historische Zeitschrift* issued on October 26 (vol. CXLVII., Heft 1) is especially dedicated to Friedrich Meinecke in honor of his seventieth birthday. Albert Brackmann, his colleague as editor of that journal, calls attention to Professor Meinecke's service as editor since 1896. The essays are contributed by his students now occupying positions of importance in Germany's institutions of higher learning.

GENERAL

General review: A. F. Hattersley, *Recent Books on World History* (History, July).

The American Council of Learned Societies has recently issued a *Union List of Selected Chinese Books in American Libraries,* compiled by Charles S. Gardner. It is a companion volume to the *Union List of Selected Western Books on Chinese in American Libraries,* published earlier in 1932.

Bulletin no. 16 (Sept.) of the International Committee of Historical Sciences presents a full report of the meetings of the committee at Budapest in 1931, with a brief report in an appendix of the meeting at The Hague last July. Included in the volume are also reports of the various commissions, especially those on iconography. There is an essay of much interest on the authentic portraits of Maria Theresa, with the reproduction of one formerly attributed to P. Goya but which probably was painted by Anton von Maron.

A sixth volume has appeared in the series of Manuels de Bibliographie Historique, in the section with the general title of *Les Sources de l'Histoire de France, XVII^e Siècle, 1610–1715.* It is *Histoire Maritime et Coloniale, Histoire Religieuse* (Paris, Picard, pp. xii, 472, 35 fr.) The editor is Professor Louis André.

A comparison of the treatment of science in *Chambers' Cyclopedia* (London, 1728), and *Zedler's Universal Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1732–1750), has been made by Philip Shorr, Ph.D., and is published under the title *Science and Superstition in the Eighteenth Century* (Columbia University Press, pp. 82, $1.50). It belongs to the series of studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. Two other publications of the same series are *The Grand Social Enterprise: a Study of Jeremy Bentham in his Relation to Liberal Nationalism,* by Elmer Louis Kayser, Ph.D., associate professor of history in George Washington University (pp. 109, $2.00), and *The French Race: Theories of its Origins, and their Social and Political Implications,* by Jacques Barzun, Ph.D. (pp. 275, $4.25).

Professor Sée's essay on *Science et Philosophie d'après la Doctrine de M. Émile Meyerson* (Paris, Alcan, pp. 203, 15 fr.) contains three chapters of special interest to students of history. They deal with the applications of the doctrine of M. Meyerson to historical research, the idea of law, and the concept of causality.

In *Spiritualisme Historique: Étude Critique sur l'Idée de Progrès* (Paris, Marcel Rivière, pp. 250, 20 fr.), M. Louis Hoyack presents a philosophy of history contrary to the current materialistic conception of progress. There are chapters on Le Message de l'Islam, La Renaissance et la Réforme, and La Civilisation Moderne.

A posthumous volume of essays by Mr. Gamaliel Bradford includes one which gives the book its title, *Biography and the Human Heart* (Houghton Mifflin, pp. 283, $3.50). The author here expresses his *credo* in regard to the style of writing in which he excelled; and in another essay, Biography by Mirror, he examines the subject of autobiographical writing. Of the seven biographical sketches in the volume, two are of perhaps lesser-known Americans—John Beauchamp Jones, the Confederate diarist, and Jones Very, poet and Shakespearean critic.

An *Atlas of Medieval and Modern History* (Henry Holt, $3.00), has been prepared by Professor William R. Shepherd, based on his *Historical Atlas*. This new, brief, edition is designed to meet the needs of survey courses in European history. It contains 80 maps covering the period from Migrations and Conquests, 150–1066, to the World, 1929. No maps of the New World are included except as part of maps of the World, but maps are given of the Growth of European and Japanese Dominion in Asia, and of the Partition of Africa. The maps used are identical with those of the larger atlas.

The Director of the Nobel Institute, R. Moe, has prepared a volume with the title of *Le Prix Nobel de la Paix et l'Institut Nobel Norvégien; Rapport Historique et Descriptif*, tome I. (Oslo, H. Aschehoug, pp. xi, 301). Half of the volume is devoted to a history of the effort for peace from 1896 to 1930, the account in this volume reaching 1914. The Taft and Bryan arbitration treaties receive considerable emphasis.

Mr. Warrington Dawson, formerly attaché of the American legation in Paris, a well-known journalist and author, is engaged in compiling a complete list of the French officers, soldiers, and sailors who died on American soil or in American waters between 1777 and 1783 for the cause of the independence of the United States. The French authorities propose to inscribe the entire roster on tablets to be placed on the walls of a special room in the palace of Versailles. Mr. Dawson desires the coöperation of interested persons in completing the list, for the records in the French archives are not free from gaps. He may be addressed at 19, rue du Maréchal Joffre, Versailles, France.

The *Canadian Historical Review* for September presents what amounts to a symposium on Local Historical Societies. It is opened by an article on The Importance of Local History in the Writing of General History, by D. C. Harvey. Louis Blake Duff discusses The Problems and Opportunities of

Canadian Historical Societies. Then follow English Local Historical Societies by F. M. Powicke, and Local Historical Societies in the United States, by Dixon Ryan Fox.

We record with regret the discontinuance of *Social Science Abstracts* with the publication of the December number. The index to volume IV. (1932) will be distributed to subscribers during the coming spring.

Article: Henri Sée, *La Philosophie de l'Histoire d'Ernest Renan* (Rev. Hist., July).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: Maurice Besnier, *Chronique d'Histoire Romaine, l'Année 1931* (Rev. des Ques. Hist., July); Cloché, *Histoire Grecque* [1929–1931] (Rev. Hist., Sept.).

Articles in the field of ancient law include those of P. Koschaker, Über einige Griechische Rechtsurkunden aus dem Oestlichen Randgebieten des Hellenismus *Abh. Sächs. Akad.*, 42, 1); R. Taubenschlag, *Ennomos Helikia* nel Diritto dei Papiri (*Aegyptus*, July); G. Beseler, Zu dem Briefe Hadrians an Plotina vom J. 121 (*Zeitschr. der Sav.-stiftung für Rechtsgesch.*, Röm. Abt., LII.).

The following reports and articles on excavations have been made: J. Jordan, third preliminary report of the excavations at Uruk (*Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1932, 2); H. Field, on human remains from Jemdet Nasr (*Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc.*, Oct.); F. Petrie and N. P. Clarke, on finds at Gaza (*Anc. Egypt*, 1932, 1–2); H. E. Winlock, excavations at the Temple of Deir el Bahri, 1921–1931 (*Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, 1932, 6); R. Dussaud, the sanctuary and the Phoenician gods of Ras Shamra (*Rev. de l'Hist. des Religions*, June); J. Garstang, on the third season at Jericho (*Jour. of the Pales. Explora. Fund*, July); G. M. Fitzgerald, on the excavations at Beth Shan in 1931, and J. W. Crowfoot, on the recent discoveries of the joint expedition to Samaria (*ibid.*); A. E. Mader, excavations at the Sea of Genesareth (*Biblica*, XIII. 3); and E. P. Blegen, New Items from Athens (*Amer. Jour. Arch.*, Sept.) containing a report of the progress of excavations at Troy. G. Calza describes recent discoveries on the Isola Sacra, and A. Maiuri, those at Pompeii (*Notizie degli Scavi*, ser. sesta, VII. 10–12). There is a description of a Roman road running from near Croyden to Malling Down near Lewes, traced by air photography (*Antiquity*, Sept.); and a restudy by R. G. Collingwood of the Sicilian fortresses of Euryalus near Syracuse, and of Selinus (*ibid.*).

The *Illustrated London News* in its recent issues pictures many interesting and important discoveries, among which may be mentioned: (Sept. 17) prehistoric cave drawings in a grotto near Labastide; (Oct. 1) finds proving and dating early contacts of Sumeria with India; (Oct. 8) a Sumerian temple and statuary at Khafaje, with reliefs which prove the presence of the horse in

Mesopotamia long before Cassite times; (Oct. 22) bronzes, pottery, and glassware showing Chinese affinities recently excavated at Luristan in Persia.

The abiding interest of the French in Egypt is illustrated in the monumental work in course of publication under the direction of M. Gabriel Hanotaux entitled *Histoire de la Nation Égyptienne.* The second volume has recently appeared with the title of *L'Égypte Pharaonique,* by Alexander Moret, professor at the Collège de France (Paris, Plon, pp. 635, 12 plates, many illustrations, 150 fr.). Vol. I., published earlier, including an Introduction Générale, was devoted to the *Géographie de l'Égypt à travers les Ages.* The author was M. Charles de la Roncière.

The subtitle, *A Descriptive Handbook,* of the late James Baikie's *Egyptian Antiquities in the Nile Valley* (Macmillan, pp. xxvi, 874, $4.50), indicates the nature of the book. The author confined his study to pre-Roman Egypt and to the antiquities now remaining in Egypt and Nubia, but within those limits he gives brief descriptions of the more important tombs, temples, and sculptural remains to be found by the traveler, and devotes, also, two chapters to the Museum at Cairo.

An eighth edition has appeared of the late H. R. Hall's *Ancient History of the Near East: from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Salamis* (London, Methuen; New York, Macmillan, pp. xxxiv, 620, $5.50). Certain revisions, based on recent discoveries in early Babylonian history, have been made by C. J. Gadd, Dr. Hall's colleague at the British Museum. The original edition was reviewed in this journal (XIX. 582) by Professor J. H. Breasted.

In *Greek Byways,* T. R. Glover (Cambridge University Press; New York, Macmillan) treats of the interest in the sea felt by the Greeks, of their unexpected knowledge and fantastic ignorance in regard to animals, of the ancient theories and practices of education, of diet and metals as they have affected history, of the manners of a gentleman as understood by the Greeks and Romans of classical and early Christian times, and of other subjects to which the average reader of the classics pays scant attention. Each subject is treated by itself, and items of information scattered through the works of ancient writers are brought together and made duly impressive. All this material is presented in a charming, easy, leisurely style, with genial humor and with frequent reference to modern conditions. H. N. F.

The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt (Columbia University Press, 1931, pp. 162, $3.00), by Edward Rochie Hardy, jr., is an interesting study of the extensive, partially independent estates in sixth century Egypt. A series of chapters upon the Apion family, other proprietors, feudalism and serfdom, and estate management, lead up to a discussion of the place of the estates in the social and economic life of Egypt as a whole. The author tries to keep a proper balance between a due recognition of the many medieval features

which had developed, notably in the serfdom of the coloni, use of the estate mill and bakery, the estate oilpress, and the estate prison, and of other features which had developed or remained. The encroachments of the large estates upon the villages, and the relations of the estate system to independent craftsmen and to the Church are also considered. The author concludes that although the large estates in Egypt touched upon all sides of Egyptian life they never were in any sense economically self-sufficient units. The work ends with a query: What would the estate system have developed into had it not been changed by the Arabic conquest?

Articles: J. Siegel, *The Date and the Historical Background of the Sinaitic Inscriptions* (Jour. Sem. Lang. and Lit., Oct.); M. J. Lagrange, *Le Site de Sodome d'après les Textes* (Rev. Bibl., Oct.); B. Meissner, *Neue Nachrichten über die Ermordung Sanheribs und die Nachfolge Asarhaddons* (Sitzber. Berl. Akad., 1932, 12); A. Momigliano, *Sparte e Lacedemone e una Ipotesi sull' Origine della Diarchia Spartana* (Atene e Roma, XIII. 1–2); F. B. Marsh, *Alcibiades and the Persian Alliance* (Class. Jour., Oct.); F. Cumont, *À propos d'un Décret d'Anisa en Cappodoce* (Rev. Études Anc., June); P. Kretschmer, *Die Herkunft der Umbrer* (Glotta, 21, 1–2); J. Whatmough, *The Calendar in Ancient Italy outside Rome* (Harvard Studies, 1931); André Oltramare, *Spurius Cassius et les Origines de la Démocratie Romaine* (Bull. Soc. d'Hist. et Arch. de Genève, V. 4); F. Oertel, *Der Ebrovertrag und der Ausbruch des Zweiten Punischen Krieges* (Rhein. Mus., 81, 3); E. Bickermann, *Rom und Lampsacus* (Philologus, 87, 3); A. Gitti, *Sul Rescritto Tolemaico di Cirene* (Aegyptus, July); A. Passerini, *La Pace con Filippo e le Relazioni con Antioco* (*Athenaeum,* X. 2); P. Treves, *Sertorio* (*ibid.*); A. Oltramare *La Réaction Ciceronienne et les Débuts du Principat* (Rev. Études Latines, X. 1); U. Wilcken, *Zur Genesis der Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (Sitzber. Berl. Akad., 1932, 11); R. Laqueur, *Kaiser Augustus und der Delator* (Hermes, 67, 2); H. I. Bell, *The Problem of the Alexandrian Senate* (Aegyptus, July); G. A. Harrer, *Inscriptions of Legates in Syria* (Amer. Jour. Arch., Sept); R. S. Rogers, *Fulvia Paulina C. Sentii Saturnini* (Amer. Jour. Philol., Sept.); A. von Premerstein, *Das Datum des Prozesses des Isidorus in den Sogenannten Heidnischen Martyrerakten* (Hermes, 67, 2).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: Giuseppe Castellani, *Storia Ecclesiastica* [medieval and early modern] (N. Antol., Sept.).

Those who are using the revised edition of L. J. Paetow's *Guide to the Study of Medieval History* (Crofts, 1931), will find pertinent corrections, additions, and suggestions in the following reviews: *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences,* July, 1931 (A. C. Baugh); *The Historical Outlook,* Oct., 1931 (J. L. La Monte); *Revue Historique,* Sept.,

1931; The London *Times Literary Supplement,* Oct. 1, 1931; *Historische Zeitschrift,* CXLV. 2 (W. Kienast); *Catholic Historical Review,* Jan., 1932 (M. R. P. McGuire); *History,* April, 1932 (F. M. Powicke); *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire,* XI. 1–2 (H. Pirenne); *Le Moyen Age,* Jan., 1932 (L. Levillain).

The Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature issued in May, 1932, the first number of its new journal *Medium Aevum* which supersedes its organ *Arthuriana.* It is planned to issue three numbers of the new periodical yearly. Of the five articles in the first number, historians will be especially interested in B. H. Sumner's Dante and the *Regnum Italicum,* and F. S. Shears's The Language of the First and Third Versions of Froissart's Chronicles.

A new French edition of R. Dozy's *Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne, 711–1110,* revised by E. Lévi-Provençal, has been published by E. J. Brill, Leiden.

A History of the Work of the Cistercians in Yorkshire (1131–1300) is the subject of a dissertation presented by Francis Anthony Mullin to the Graduate School of the Catholic University of America (Washington, pp. xi, 129).

Professor J. P. Whitney, of the University of Cambridge, with a rare knowledge of the literature of his subject, has investigated a large number of neglected, obscure, and controversial points in the ecclesiastical history of the Hildebrandine period (*Hildebrandine Essays,* Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, pp. xx, 184, $2.80). Each discussion is accompanied by extremely full critical, bibliographical notes. In his treatment of the wider phases of his subject the author is hampered by his complete absorption in ecclesiastical history. He is aware of the social, economic, and political elements which entered into the investiture struggle, but he gives them little or no weight. He ignores completely the effect of the immense temporal power and wealth of the Church. Hence his entire discussion of the Church and state is necessarily incomplete. S. P.

Articles: René Aigrain, *Comment utiliser les Inscriptions Chrétiennes* (Rev. d'Hist. de l'Église de France, July); J. H. Finley, jr., *Corinth in the Middle Ages* (Speculum, Oct.); H. H. Schaeder, *Bardesanes* [criticism of sources for a projected work on the origins of Manichæanism] (Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., 1932, Heft 1–2); J. P. Whitney, *The Growth of Papal Jurisdiction and Leo the Great* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV. 1); Alfons Dopsch, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im frühen Mittelalter* (Tijdschr. voor Rechtsgesch., XI. 4); A. Dondeyne, *La Discipline des Scrutins dans l'Église Latine avant Charlemagne* [concluded] (Rev. d'Hist. Ecclés., Oct.); E. Delaruelle, *Charlemagne, Carloman, Didier et la Politique du Mariage Franco-Lombard, 770–771* (Rev. Hist., Sept.); A. Brackmann, *Der Römische Erneuerungsgedanke und*

seine Bedeutung für die Reichspolitik der Deutschen Kaiserzeit (Sitzber. der Preus. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Philos.-Hist. Klasse, 1932, XVII.); C. Erdmann, *Der Heidenkrieg in der Liturgie und die Kaiserkrönung Ottos I.* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsfor., XLVI. 2.); Paul Kirn, *Die Mittelalterliche Staatsverwaltung als Geistesgeschichtliches Problem* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Oct.); Adolf Hofmeister, *Der Übersetzer Johannes und das Geschlecht Comitis Mauronis in Amalfi: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen besonders im XI. Jahrhundert* (*ibid.*, July); U. Berlière, *L'Étude des Réformes Monastiques des X^e^ et XI^e^ Siècles* (Acad. Royale de Belg., Bull. de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences, 1932, facs. 3–5); J. Cottiaux, *La Conception de la Théologie chez Abélard* [concluded] (Rev. d'Hist. Ecclés., Oct.); J. de Ghellinck, *Les "Opera Dubia vel Spuria" attribués à Pierre Lombard* (*ibid.*); Hans van Werveke, *Monnaie, Lingots ou Marchandises?: Les Instruments d'Échange aux XI^e^ et XII^e^ Siècles* (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.); H. Weisweiler, *L'École d' Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux: Nouveaux Documents* (Recherches de Théol. Anc. et Méd., July); J. C. Russell, *Hereford and Arabic Science in England about 1175–1200* (Isis, July); E. Gomez, *Saint Albertus Magnus and his Works in Oxford University* (New Scholasticism, Oct.); K. Hampe, *Das Neueste Lebensbild Kaiser Friedrichs II.* [apropos of *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite,* by Ernst Kantorowicz; see *Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXVII. 533] (Hist. Zeitschr., Aug.); M. C. Welborn, *The Errors of the Doctors according to Friar Roger Bacon of the Minor Order* (Isis, July); Lynn Thorndike, *Rufinus: a Forgotten Botanist of the Thirteenth Century* (*ibid.*); A. G. Little, *Chronological Notes on the Life of Duns Scotus* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); S. d'Irsay, *L'Opinion Publique dans les Universités Médiévales* (Rev. des Études Hist., July); Georges de Lagarde, *Marsile de Padoue et Guillaume de Nogaret* (Rev. Hist. de Droit, July-Sept.); T. P. Oakley, *The Coöperation of Mediaeval Penance and Secular Law* (Speculum, Oct.); J. F. Willard, *The Use of Carts in the Fourteenth Century* (History, Oct.); Heinrich Finke, *Ueber Schisma-Publikationen: ein Vergiftungsversuch gegen Urban VI.* (Hist. Jahrb., vol. LII., Heft 3); B. Bughetti, *Statutum Concordiae inter Quatuor Ordines Mendicantes, Annis 1435, 1458 et 1475 Sancitum* (Arch. Franciscanum Hist., Apr.); H. G. Keller, *Die Erbauung der Burg und die Entstehung der Stadt Thun: eine Burgen- und Stadtgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Zeitschr. für Schweizer. Gesch., XII. 3).

G. C. B.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: Gustav Krüger, *Zur Literatur über die Rosenkreuzer* (Hist. Zeitschr., Aug.); Martin Gerhardt, *Innere Mission und Christlich-Sociale Bewegung* (Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., 1932, Heft 1–2).

The much-discussed question of the influence of Calvinism upon the de-

velopment of capitalism and of political theory is the subject of two reviews by Heinrich Bornkamm in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* 1932, Heft 1–2. The books are Ernest Beins's *Die Wirtschaftsethik der Calvinischen Kirche der Niederlande, 1565–1650* (1931), and Otto Hintze's *Calvinismus und Staatsräson im Brandenburg zu Beginn des 17. Jahrhundert* (1930).

Calvinism and the Religious Wars, by Franklin Charles Palm (Holt, pp. ix, 117, $1.00) belongs to the useful series of Berkshire Studies in European History. The treatment deals first with Calvin's development and his influence in Geneva. Calvinism and the Religious Wars in France is the subject of the second of the three chapters. The third presents brief sketches of the spread of Calvinism into many European countries and across the sea to America. The problem of selection here is extremely difficult and delicate. Perhaps some of the Mayflower descendants will be surprised to learn that in Plymouth colony there "was no occupation which the community enjoyed more than spying, and no duty apparently gave them more pleasure than that of complaining of the conduct of some individual". Probably remarks of this type, together with the long quotation from Hudibras about the Puritans, are sops thrown to Cerberus, for the general attitude of the author is entirely fair.

Léon Cahen, who is professor of primary education at the École Normale Supérieure, in *Les Débuts du Monde Contemporain, 1789–1848* (Paris, Alcan, pp. viii, 460, 20 fr.) has written what he calls in his subtitle an *Esquisse d'un Demi-Siècle d'Histoire.* In that half-century, he declares in his introduction, were developed those tendencies which characterize the modern world, the organization of democracy, the safeguarding of nationalities, and a harmony of economic functions. Perhaps the special utility of such a volume is to be found in its embodiment, in brief form, of the results of recent scholarly investigation within the field covered.

Demokratie und Partei, edited by Peter Richard Rohden (Vienna, L. W. Seidel, pp. 364, $2.40), is a brief review and discussion of the characteristics of democratic and party government in England, the United States, France, Germany, Russia, and Italy. There is also an essay on the position of Catholicism in relation to democracy. The contributors are Kingsley B. Smellie, of the London School of Economics, Adolf Rein, of the University of Hamburg, Edmond Vermeil, of the University of Strasbourg, D. S. Mirsky, Wolfango Ludovico Stein, Alois Dempf, of the University of Bonn, and the editor. Professor Rein writes on the United States. His treatment is mainly historical. His conclusions are not flattering; emphasizing a two party system in which the differences of aim are negligible, and in which also the professional politician, who is not a responsible official, has become master of the machine. The saving element in the situation Professor Rein finds in the craving of the democratic masses for leadership in the President.

The vicissitudes of the naval armament question is the subject of *Lord*

Haldane's Zending naar Berlijn in 1912: de Duitsch-Engelsche Onderhandelingen over de Vlootquaestie, 1905–1912, a doctoral dissertation by Bernhard Daniel Ernest Kraft (Utrecht, Kemink and Son, pp. 367). It is based upon a thorough study of the mass of documents now available, especially of vol. VI. of the British series.

The most recent volumes of the French official history of the World War are: tome VI., vol. I., *La Préparation de la Campagne 1918: l'Offensive Allemande de l'Oise à la Mer du Nord,* Nov. 1, 1917-Apr. 30, 1918, with three volumes of annexes and a case of maps; tome IX., vol. II., *Les Campagnes Coloniales:Togo, Cameroun,* with four volumes of annexes and a case of maps (Imprimerie Nationale, 500 and 790 fr.)

A new contribution to the history of the World War is made by General Mario Caracciolo in his *L'Italia ed i suoi Alleati nella Grande Guerra* (Milan, Mondadori).

With positions strangely reversed, the Germans are now contending, like Poincaré in 1923, that Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles constitutes an admission of German guilt. Hajo Holborn in *Kriegsschuld und Reparationen auf der Pariser Friedenskonferenz von 1919* (Leipzig, Grundfragen der Internationalen Politik, Heft 3), sums up the evidence against those writers (Halperin, Binkley, Bloch, Renouvin) who have argued that this article is merely an acknowledgment of civil liability. He concludes that the economic and moral liquidation of the war requires a common consciousness of responsibility and a general recognition of non-partisanship. R. C. B.

As the attitude of competent observers toward the changing complex of events since the World War is so important to the historian, the volume of selections from the writings of the late Jacques Seydoux entitled *De Versailles au Young Plan* (Paris, Plon, pp. xxi, 333, 36 fr.) is especially notable. M. Seydoux's life was spent in the diplomatic service, either in French embassies or at the Quai d'Orsay. He was a leading figure in all the post-war conferences because of his eminence as a commercial and financial expert. This volume is made up of articles which he published from time to time in journals like the *Revue d'Économie Politique* and *L'Europe Nouvelle,* upon every phase of the reparations question and the reconstruction of Europe. Each selection has an introduction, contributed by the editors, MM. Jacques Arnavon and E. de Felcourt. A preface, with a sketch of the life of M. Seydoux, is contributed by M. François Charles-Roux, minister of France at Prague. Americans may not be pleased by the comments of M. Seydoux upon our financial policies, but he wrote when we were still the richest and most prosperous nation in the world, and before France, in alarm at the rumored weakness of the dollar had called home her enormous gold balances.

Articles: Per Sörensson, *Das Kriegswesen während der Letzten Periode*

des Dreissigjährigen Krieges (Hist. Vierteljahr., Oct.); Elise Despréaux, *Le Cabinet de Versailles et le Conflit entre la Russie et la Pologne en Courlande au Début du XVIII^e Siècle* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., July); John Horsch, *The Rise and Early History of the Swiss Brethren Church*, pt. 1, *The Rise of State Church Protestantism* (Mennonite Quar., July); Harold Temperley, *The Treaty of Paris of 1856 and its Execution* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept., Dec.); Wilhelm Schüssler, *Bismarck zwischen England und Russland in der Krise von 1879–80: ein Kritisches Nachwort* [in reference to the view of A. O. Meyer that Bismarck would have negotiated an alliance with England but for the opposition of the Emperor William] (Hist. Vierteljahr., July); Alfred von Wittich, *Die Rüstungen Oesterreich-Ungarns von 1866 bis 1914* (Berl. Monatsh., Sept.); Werner Frauendienst, *Graf Alvenslebens Petersburger Mission 1900 bis 1905* (*ibid.*); Georges Fotino, *Les Missions de Goluchowski et de Bülow auprès du Carol I^er de Roumanie* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., July); I. F. D. Morrow, *The Foreign Policy of Prince von Bülow, 1898–1909* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV. 1); Camille Barrère, *Souvenirs Diplomatiques: la Chute de Delcassé* (Rev. des D. M., Aug. 1); Paul Herre, *Die Kleinen Staaten und die Entstehung des Weltkriegs* [I.] (Berl. Monatsh., Nov.); H. E. Enthoven, *Kiderlen-Wächter und die Deutsche Agadir-Politik* (Eur. Gespräche, July); Esther C. Brunauer, *The Peace Proposals of December, 1916–January, 1917* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.); Hamilton Fish Armstrong, *Versailles: Retrospect* (Foreign Affairs, Oct.); Harold Temperley, *"War Guilt" and the Peace Treaty* (History, Oct).

GREAT BRITAIN

General review: F. L. Baumann, *Sir Thomas More* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.); W. T. Laprade, *The Present State of the History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (*ibid.*).

The committee appointed by the first lord of the treasury in March, 1929, of which Professor Wallace Notestein is an American member, "to report on the materials available for a record of the personnel and politics of the past members of the House of Commons from 1264 to 1832" has published through the Stationery Office an *Interim Report*. As the result of much preliminary work, the committee recommends that the project be carried forward if the £30,000 estimated to be needed for the purpose can be obtained from other sources than the exchequer. Meanwhile, some twelve hundred names of members of early parliaments have been discovered in addition to those found in the "Official Return" published in 1878. The report indicates the sources from which this information has been derived. Appended are several interesting lists including one of the parliaments held 1258–1832, giving, where possible, the "Date of Testing the Writ of Summons", "Term of the Session", "Place to which Summoned", "Date for which Summoned", "Dates of Election of Commons", and "Dates of Dismissal of Commons". W. T. L.

Vol. II. of the Royal Commission's *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Herefordshire* (London, H. M. Stationery Office, pp. xxxv, 266, 190 plates, 30*s.*) follows with surprising promptitude vol. I. (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI. 196). That dealt with the southwestern section of the county, including Hereford itself, while this deals with the eastern section. A third volume will conclude the survey of the county. Although there is for this volume no great church like Hereford cathedral, or castle like Goodrich, the monuments studied and photographed are of a hardly slighter interest. The great prehistoric camp on the Herefordshire Beacon, illustrated by three remarkable photographs, the remains of the Roman Magna near Kenchester, and Ledbury with its many timber-framed dwellings, enrich the treatment. Concerning Ledbury one curious fact is noted in the sectional preface: "the timber-framing . . . in these early buildings is widely spaced to form a square framework, the close-set studding not being commonly employed until the latter part of the 15th century." The commission recommends as "especially worthy of preservation" a long list of earthworks and of ecclesiastical and secular buildings. This means government protection against vandals of all types.

The May *Bulletin* of the Board of Celtic Studies, of the University of Wales, prints a second installment of A Bibliography of Monographs on the Place-names of Wales, the first having appeared in 1930 (V. 249–264).

Vols. VIII. and IX. of the English Place-name Society are concerned with the *Place-names of Devon* (Cambridge University Press, 40*s.*). One of the curious results of the survey is the fact that although the Celts remained in Devon longer than in the counties immediately to the east, very few place-names of Celtic origin have endured. It is conjectured that the Celtic population of the region was sparse and did not constitute any large fraction of the inhabitants after the Saxon conquest. The authors of these volumes are J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, and F. M. Stenton.

With the publication of *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Tenth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First,* edited by Mrs. Doris M. Stenton, the work of the Pipe Roll Society for the reign of Richard I. is completed. It forms vol. IX. of the new series.

Under the direction of the keeper of registers and records of Scotland, has been issued a volume entitled *Acts of the Lords of Council in Public Affairs, 1501–1554,* being selections from the Acta Dominorum Concilii introductory to the Register of the Privy Council of Scotland. The editor is Robert Kerr Hannay (Edinburgh, General Register House, pp. lxvii, 719, 45*s.*).

In *The Counter Reformation in Scotland, 1560–1930* (James Clarke, 1931, 7*s.* 6*d.*), Donald Maclean makes the point that the immigration of the Irish to Scotland in the nineteenth century hastened materially the growth of the

Roman Catholic Church in that country, which had been comparatively slow from the seventeenth century until that time. W. T. L.

To the series entitled La Grande Légende de la Mer, M. Léon Lemonnier has added a volume on *Sir Francis Drake* (Paris, Renaissance du Livre, pp. 255, 15 fr.). In an appendix are printed interesting documents, hitherto unpublished. There is an excellent bibliography.

The Historical Manuscripts Commission has issued a *Supplementary Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Hamilton,* edited by Jane Harvey McMaster and Marguerite Wood (H. M. Stationery Office, pp. 253, 5*s*.). The dates of the manuscripts run from 1563 to 1794. A group of undated manuscripts is given in appendix II. Appendix I. contains interesting records of military expenditure in the Thirty Years' War.

Other recent publications of the Stationery Office are: vol. IV. of the *Calendar of Close Rolls,* covering the years 1409–1413 of the reign of Henry IV.; *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.,* pt. II. of vol. I., *Addenda;* and *Journal of the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations from January 1749/1750 to December, 1753.*

The Wren Society has brought together in *The Parochial Churches of Sir Christopher Wren, 1666–1718,* printed for the society at the Oxford University Press, and as vol. IX. of their publications, John Clayton's *Churches of Sir Christopher Wren,* which appeared in 1848, and reproductions of original Wren drawings and of contemporary engravings collected by Samuel Pepys. The editors, Arthur T. Bolton and H. Duncan Hendry, have supplied a preliminary note and an introduction.

Vol. III. of the Bristol Record Society's Publications is entitled *Bristol Corporation of the Poor: Selected Records, 1696–1834.* The editor is E. E. Butcher of the University of Bristol. Most of the documents are from the Court Books of the Corporation of the Poor and indicate the organized efforts in Bristol to deal with poverty in the period 1653–1834. The bulk of the material dates from the generations just after 1696 and just preceding 1834. In 1696 came the act of Parliament authorizing the incorporation of the seventeen city parishes and the castle precincts for establishing a "manufactory" for "the better employment and maintaining the poor". In 1834 Parliament enacted country-wide legislation dealing with the same question. An introductory survey of the subject by the editor occupies thirty-eight pages of the book. Appended is a list of the guardians with biographical particulars. W. T. L.

Eyre and Spottiswoode have issued in comparatively small editions two works important for students of the history of England in the eighteenth century: Bonamy Dobrée's *The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, Fourth Earl of Chesterfield* (6 vols., £12 12*s*.) and Romany Sedgwick's *Some Materials towards Memoirs of the Reign of King George II., by John, Lord*

Hervey (3 vols., 1931, £5 5*s*.). Mr. Sedgwick has had the use of an unexpurgated manuscript in the royal archives at Windsor; thus his edition of Hervey contains new matter. Of the more than 2500 letters in Mr. Dobrée's edition of Chesterfield, some 1400 are published for the first time. W. T. L.

The Industrial Revolution in Scotland, by Henry Hamilton (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 15*s*.) is the first attempt to deal separately with the economic phenomena of Scotland during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The ordinary reader of British industrial history, a little weak perhaps in geography, does not always realize how many important establishments were created north of the Border. This work deals with agriculture, shipping, and finance, as well as with industry in the narrower sense.

Material of value for the study of the Second Burmese War, and of the years that followed, will be found in *The Dalhousie-Phayre Correspondence, 1852–1856,* edited by D. G. E. Hall (Oxford University Press, 30*s*.). The volume is made up of Dalhousie's letters to Phayre, while the latter was administrator of Pegu, and of Phayre's journal, both of which now are a part of the collection of the University of Rangoon.

Sir George Otto Trevelyan's *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay,* which was added to the series entitled The World's Classics, is published in this country by the Oxford University Press (2 vols., 80 cents).

Dr. Joseph Ellis Baker's dissertation entitled *The Novel and the Oxford Movement* is published as no. 8 in the Princeton Studies in English (Princeton University Press, pp. xiii, 220).

An interesting phase of the history of emigration is dealt with in vol. VI. of the Royal Empire Society Imperial Studies, entitled *Education for Empire Settlement,* by Alexander G. Scholes (Longmans, Green, pp. xii, 250, 7*s*. 6*d*.). As the subtitle, *A Study of Juvenile Migration,* indicates, it describes the effort, especially since the Empire Settlement Act of 1922, to save for the useful tasks of the dominions many of the boys and girls who are in danger of being added to the increasing army of the unemployed.

A new chapter entitled Later Anglo-Saxon England, the rearrangement of old sections and the addition of new, to the chapters on the Feudal Period, the Work of Henry II., and the Growth of the Constitution, form some of the revisions in the second edition of Frederick C. Dietz's *Political and Social History of England* (Macmillan, pp. xxii, 786, $3.75). Later chapters on British Foreign Policy, 1890–1914, and on the War, have also been revised, and the discussion on the recent developments in the British empire has been brought up to 1932.

Articles: G. Lapsley, *Buzones* [II.] (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); C. R. Cheney, *Letters of William Wickwane, Chancellor of York, 1266–1268* (*ibid*.); D. D.

Egbert, *The Tickhill Psalter: an English Illuminated Manuscript of the Early Fourteenth Century* (Bull. N. Y. Public Library, Oct.); B. J. H. Rowe, *John, Duke of Bedford, and the Norman 'Brigands'* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); Kathleen L. Wood-Legh, *Some Aspects of the History of the Chantries during the Reign of Edward III.* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV. 1); T. F. T. Plucknett, *The Place of the Legal Profession in the History of English Law* (Law Quar. Rev., July); J. V. Kitto, *The House of Commons Mace* (Notes and Queries, Sept. 24); Bertha H. Putnam, *John Tindall's Contribution to Rastell's Abridgment of Statutes* (*ibid.*, Oct. 8); Richard Jones, *Science and Language in England of the Mid-Seventeenth Century* (Jour. Eng. and Ger. Philology, July); Harold Hulme, *The Leadership of Sir John Eliot in the Parliament of 1626* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.); Keith Feiling, *Henrietta Stuart, Duchess of Orleans, and the Origins of the Treaty of Dover* [an important unpublished letter, probably of Sept., 1668] (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); A. W. Johns, *The* CONSTANT WARWICK (Mariner's Mirror, July); G. A. Ballard, *British Battleships of 1870: the* ROYAL OAK *and* ROYAL ALFRED (*ibid.*); A. F. Fremantle, *The Truth about Oliver, the Spy* [a government agent in 1817] (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); E. Welbourne, *Bankruptcy before the Era of Victorian Reform* (Cam. Hist. Jour., IV. 1); Paul Ostwald, *Der Zweite English-Japanische Bündnisvertrag* (Berl. Monatsh., Oct.); Charles Firth, *Macaulay's Third Chapter* (History, Oct.).

FRANCE

General review: G. M. Dutcher, *Napoleon and the Napoleonic Period* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.).

Vol. X. (1629) of the *Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu* has just been published by the Société de l'Histoire de France.

It is possible to read Mercier's celebrated *Tableau de Paris* in an abridged English translation made by Helen Simpson and published by Harrap under the title *The Waiting City*.

A Centre d'Études de la Révolution Française has been established at the University of Paris. The director is the well-known historian, Philippe Sagnac.

On the jacket of Pierre Gaxotte's *The French Revolution* (Scribner's, pp. xiv, 416, $3.00), the statement is made that "84 editions of this book were sold in France". The reader who is familiar with the details of the great transformation in 1789, and the years that followed, will probably ask, "Why this phenomenal sale?" The answer will not be found in the book itself, although it is well written and abounds in clever characterizations. Perhaps a part of the answer may be that just now Soviet historians are working industriously to show that the revolutionary movement in 1794 was the precursor of the communistic revolution in Russia. The late Professor Mathiez's

emphasis on the social aim of the confiscatory laws of *Ventôse* doubtless has helped them in their quest. All this has naturally strengthened the reactionary antagonism among certain French groups toward much that was true of the Revolution. M. Gaxotte frankly disclaims adding to our knowledge by his researches. He borrows his facts from men as widely separated as Cochin and Mathiez, quoting passages or referring to such writers as his narrative reaches the phases they have investigated. It need not be added that he does not borrow from pro-Revolution historians to praise the Revolution, but to discredit some features of it. The picture he is endeavoring to draw is his, not theirs. He adopts an attitude of impartiality, and for pages at a time his account is surprisingly impartial, but the total effect is a caricature, rather than a true picture, of the Revolution. His narrative is also not free from plain errors of fact. The translator, Professor Walter Alison Phillips, in an introduction offers his explanation of the significance of the book.

The French have a fashion of changing street names with a change of régime and in 1879 it was proposed to rechristen the Boulevard Haussmann. Baron Haussmann's admirers protested, but Haussmann said: "Laissez faire. On peut effacer une inscription. Tant que Paris vivra, mon nom restera gravé sur toutes les pierres." It is this fact that makes Georges Laronge's biography of the great prefect so absorbingly interesting. The volume entitled *Le Baron Haussmann* (Paris, Alcan, pp. 258, 15 fr.) is furnished neither with notes nor a bibliography, but it is evidently the outcome of a patient study of the records. Haussmann, as M. Laronge portrays him, was unquestionably a great administrator. He too readily forgot what he owed to the Orleans princes to be deemed a great character.

In the series of Les Grandes Figures Coloniales two new volumes have appeared: *La Bourdonnais,* by Louis Roubaud, and *Faidherbe,* by André Demaison (Paris, Plon, pp. 229, 281, 15 fr. each). The first was the founder of the Ile de France and the second the Père du Sénégal. The volumes give, then, the history of the formative period of two French colonies. Faidherbe also played a part in the Franco-Prussian War, and M. Demaison gives an interesting account of the campaign in northern France where General Faidherbe was put in command by Gambetta. M. Roubaud opens his account of La Bourdonnais appropriately with a description of Saint-Malo and of the influences in that haunt of seventeenth century adventurers and corsairs which stimulated the imagination of the future colonial.

The Société Historique Algérienne has published the record of the *Deuxième Congrès National des Sciences Historiques,* held at Algiers in honor of the centenary of the colony, on April 14–16, 1930 (Algiers, pp. 396). Most of the papers naturally dealt with phases of Algerian history. Professor Halvdan Koht presented a paper on Les Répercussions de la Conquête de l'Algérie sur la Politique Scandinave. Among those beyond the limits of the

particular field was the discussion by Camille Bloch on La Déclaration de Londres et le Différend Anglo-Américain de 1914–1916 sur la Liberté des Mers.

When General Weygand was received last May as a member of the French Academy, after his election to the chair made vacant by the death of Marshal Joffre, his discourse according to custom took the career of his predecessor as a theme (*Le Fauteuil du Maréchal Joffre: Discours de Réception de M. le Général Weygand à l'Académie Française et Réponse de M. Jules Cambon,* Paris, Plon, pp. 136). General Weygand sketches with a sure hand the development of Joffre's character as a soldier during years of experience in the colonies and then presents his own version of the Marne incident.

Articles: Gustave Dupont-Ferrier, *Les Origines et le Premier Siècle de la Chambre ou Cour des Aides de Paris* (Rev. Hist., Sept.); H. Prentout, *Louis XI. et l'Angleterre* (Jour. des Savants, June); Elisabeth Feist, *Königsmacht und Ständefreiheit: Kämpfe um den Staat bei der Tagung der Französischen Generalstände in Blois, 1576* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Oct.); Ed. Esmonin, *Le Fèvre de Caumartin, Intendant de Picardie pendant trente-deux Ans* [à propos de l'établissement des intendants] (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., May); Daniel Mornet, *L'Éveil de la Curiosité Intellectuelle dans les Provinces Françaises et ses Conséquences, 1770–1789* (Rev. de Paris, Aug. 1); Jean Marchand, ed., *François de la Rochefoucauld: Voyage en France, 1781–1783* [extracts from a work written by the son of the Duc de Liancourt, to be published in two volumes by the Société de l'Histoire de France] (Rev. des Ques. Hist., July); Georges Lefebvre, *Sur Danton* [apropos of the recent volumes of Hermann Wendel and Louis Barthou, and in general support of the main positions adopted by the late Albert Mathiez] (An. Hist. de la Rév. Fr., Sept.); Pierre Caron, *La Commune de Paris et les Massacres de Septembre* [II.] (Rév. Fr., Apr.); Wilfred B. Kerr, *Le Parti Modéré et la Lutte des Classes à la Convention* (An. Hist. de la Rév. Fr., Sept.); F. Braesch, *Une Étude sur l'Histoire de l'Assignat* (Rév. Fr., Apr.); Louis Madelin, *Vers l'Empire* [Cadoudal conspiracy and D'Enghien affair, I., concl.] (Rev. des D. M., Sept. 15, Oct. 1); René Martel, *Napoléon en Lithuanie, 1812; d'après des Documents Inédits* (Rev. de Paris, Aug. 15); Lefebvre de Béhaine, Le Crépuscule de l'Empire [cont'd; situation on the Rhine frontier in November, 1813] (Rev. des Ques. Hist., July); Marcel Blanchard, ed., *Journal de Michel Chevalier, 1865–1869* (Rev. des D. M. Nov. 1); Georges Yver, *Alger et Algérie* (Rev. Hist., Sept.); François Lescazes, *Léon Gambetta et l'Armistice de 1871; les Procédés de M. de Bismarck* (N. Rev., Sept. 15).

THE NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

General review: L. Cahen, E. Coornaert, *et al., Bibliographie relatifs aux Pays-Bas et à la Belgique* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., May).

Especially to be commended is the publication of documents relating to the

care of the sick and to hospitals (*Documents pour servir à l'Étude des Maladies Pestilentielles dans le Marquisat d'Anvers jusqu'à la Chute de l'Ancien Régime,* edited by Dr. A. F. C. Van Schevensteen [Académie Royale de Belgique, Commission Royale d'Histoire] Brussels, Lamertin, 2 vols, pp. xviii, 435, 492). The rise of towns is an admittedly capital fact in the Middle Ages, but it is less often realized that the institutions which grew up in urban centers are equally significant. This collection of official acts dealing with contagious diseases in Antwerp starts with 1454 and closes in 1793. The student will find much information about methods of fighting contagion, methods of hospital administration, and enforcement of quarantine, the last particularly interesting because Antwerp was an important port. H. S. L.

A tool of obvious value to historians is the exhaustive *Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Publique de la Ville de Mons,* prepared by Paul Faider and Mme. Faider-Feytmans (Ghent, Van Rysselberghe, 1931, pp. xlvi, 648). It is one of the publications of the University of Ghent and covers 600 volumes with a total of 1200 bibliographical items.

The life of the Dutch people, in all its phases, their history and institutions, their economic activities, their achievements in literature and art, the land in which they live, are described clearly and succinctly in a little volume entitled *La Hollande* (Paris, Rieder, pp. 178, 8 plates, 20 fr.), by Professor Salverda de Grave, of the University of Amsterdam. The volume belongs to the series of Les États Contemporains, published under the direction of MM. Caron and Lhéritier. The preface is contributed by F. Brunot, of the University of Paris.

Article: Victor Day, *The Church in Contemporary Belgium* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Oct.).

GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND CENTRAL EUROPE

General review: Marc Bloch, *Histoire d'Allemagne, Moyen Age* [concl.] (Rev. Hist., July); Hermann Wendorf, *Schriften zum 100. Todestage des Freiherrn vom Stein* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Oct.).

The *Zeitschrift der Savigny-stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* [Germanistische Abteilung] has issued a *Generalregister* to volumes I.-L. (Weimar, Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, pp. viii, 365, 24 M.). It is the work of Rudolph Bechert and others. The plan is admirable. There are three indexes: names, divided into seven sections—authors of essays, of miscellanies, reviews, works reviewed, etc.; subjects; and sources. By various devices the index of subjects offers cross references which secure the maximum of usefulness. An appendix gives an index of Heinrich Brunner's *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Deutschen und Französischen Rechtes* (1894), and of his *Abhandlungen zur Rechtsgeschichte* (1931, reviewed here in Oct., 1932).

A bibliography of books and articles relating to German history at the

time of the Reformation (*Bibliographie zur Deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung, 1517–1585*) has been prepared by Karl Schottenlohrer under the auspices of the Committee for the Investigation of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. It will include 40,000 entries, and will appear in fascicles of 160 pages each. The publisher is Karl W. Hiersemann, of Leipzig, and the price per fascicle is fifteen Swiss francs.

Two recent publications in the period of the Thirty Years' War are Werner Lahne's monograph, *Magdeburgs Zerstörung in der Zeitgeschichtlichen Publizistik; Gedenkschrift des Magdeburger Geschichtsvereins zum 10 Mai 1931* (Magdeburg, Verlag des Geschichtsvereins, 1931, pp. xiv, 259), and Felix Plage's study, *Die Einnahme der Stadt Frankfurt a. d. Oder durch Gustav Adolph König von Schweden am 3 April, 1631, nach Aelteren Berichten Bearbeitet* (Frankfurt a. d. Oder, Trowitzsch, 1931, pp. 55).

Just a quarter of a century after its initial volume, the important *Entwicklungsgeschichte Bayerns* by Michael Doeberl reaches its conclusion with vol. III., *Vom Regierungsantritt König Ludwigs I. bis zum Tode König Ludwigs II.; mit einem Ausblick auf die Innere Entwicklung Bayerns unter dem Prinzregenten Luitpold* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1931, pp. xiv, 639). The book appears after the author's regretted death, which took place in 1928; it has been prepared for publication by Max Spindler.

Prince Paul Esterhazy has earned the gratitude of historians by publishing in two handsome volumes the *Documents des Archives du Palatin Nicolas Esterhazy,* his ancestor, who lived from 1583 to 1645. Vol. I., published in 1930, contained Hungarian texts dealing with Hungarian internal affairs; vol. II., though in Turkish, is accompanied by a German translation and covers the period of the Thirty Years' War. The editor is Louis Fekete (Budapest, pp. 504).

A new biography of Maria Theresa, based especially on the works of Arneth, Bermann, and Coxe, has been written by J. Alexander Mahan (Thomas Y. Crowell Company, pp. xiii, 366, $3.75).

An important study of the German element on the eastern shore of the Baltic, of German imperial policy toward it, and of the causes of the movement for Russification is made by Heinrich Schandinn in *Das Baltische Deutschtum und Bismarcks Reichsgründung* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, pp. vii, 206, 9.60 M.). It belongs to the Königsberg series of historical researches edited by Fr. Baethgen and H. Rothfels.

A phase of Bismarck's career which has hitherto failed to receive sufficient attention is his friendship for John Lothrop Motley, and his relations with Bancroft and other Americans. This is the subject of a dissertation of Dr. L. L. Snyder entitled *Die Persönlichen und Politischen Beziehungen Bismarcks zu Amerikanern.*

In *Die Nationale Differenzierung und Integrierung der Slovaken und Tschechen in ihren Geschichtlichen Verlauf bis 1848* (Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk and Son, 1931, pp. 208, 3 fl.), Dr. Th. J. Locher has presented a serious study, not a work of propaganda. After a brief presentation of the question of Czechoslovak unity, the author, in six chapters, discusses the geographical distribution of the two peoples, their political relations with each other and their neighbors, their cultural connections up to the eighteenth century, the effect of modern nationalism upon them, Romantic Pan-Slavism, the birth of the Slovak national idea, and then, in the seventh chapter, develops his conclusions. Here he approaches the nearest to propaganda as he states his reasons for the triumph of the Czechoslovak instead of the Hungarian-Slovak solution of the question, and, it should be added, gives them most convincingly, thus clearing up various points that have been unnecessarily made hazy by previous writers. Dr. Locher has analyzed the ideas of certain leading Slovaks in one chapter, while in another he has gone back to Kollárs, Šafařik, Palacký, etc. No bibliography is attached. A. I. A.

Articles: Bernhard Sommerlad, *Das Hallische Urkundenbuch* [documents of the Teutonic Order relative to grants of benefices and other property in the 13th century] (Thüring.-Säch. Zeitschr. für Gesch. und Kunst, XX. 1–2); Friedrich Bothe, *Frankfurts Wirtschaftsleben im Mittelalter* (Zeitschr. für die Gesamte Staatswiss., XCIII. 2); Louise Sommer, *Erkenntnisgebiet und Methode in der Aelteren Deutschen Volkswirtschaftslehre* (*ibid.*); Hermann Wendorf, *Der Durchbruch der neuen Erkenntnis Luthers im Lichte der Handschriftlichen Überlieferung* [II.] (Hist. Vierteljahr., July); Karl Helleiner, *Eine Religionspolitische Denkschrift an Maximilian II. aus der Feder des Caspar Hirsch, 1574* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsf., XLVI. 2); Gustav Berthold Volz, *Prince Heinrich als Kritiker Friedrichs des Grossen* (Hist. Vierteljahr., July); Heinrich Ritter von Sbrik, *Die Bergmännischen Anfänge des Freiherrn vom Stein 1779 und ihr Nachklang 1811–12* (Hist. Zeitschr., Aug.); Eduard Clavery, *Une Condemnation pour Sorcellerie en Suisse Romande au Temps Jadis, d'après les Mémoires de Francisco de Miranda* (Rev. de l'Amér. Latine, Apr.); P. David, *Recherches sur l'Histoire de la Poméranie Polonaise* [II.] (Rev. des Ques. Hist., July); Albert Schreiber, *Leopold Ranke, Heinrich Ritter und Friedrich Perthes; ein Beitrag zu ihrer Charakteristik; mit Auszügen aus 36 Ungedruckten Briefen* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Oct.); Eugen Franz, *Graf Rechbergs Deutsche Zollpolitik 1859–1864* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsf., XLVI. 2); R. W. Seton-Watson, *The Emperor Francis Joseph* (History, July, Oct.); Robert Stupperich, *Die Russische Kirchengeschichte in Deutschland seit 1914: Motive und Ergebnisse* (Zeitschr. für Osteur. Gesch., Heft 4, 1932).

E. N. C.

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: R. G. Woolbert, *Italian Colonial Expansion in Africa* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.); Giuseppe Gabrieli, *Biografie* [books and articles on Cardinal Borromeo] (N. Antol., Sept. 1).

Valuable material for the history of medieval Italian commerce and finance is furnished by Armando Sapori's recent work, *Una Compagnia di Calimala ai Primi del Trecento* (Florence, Olschki, pp. 420), issued as vol. VII. of the Biblioteca Storica Toscana, published by the R. Deputazione Toscana di Storia Patria.

A new edition of Francesco Guicciardini's *Dialogo e Discorsi del Reggimento di Firenze* has been prepared by Roberto Palmarocchi (Bari, Laterza, pp. 304). Of even greater interest is the publication of a *Diario del Viaggio in Spagna,* recently found in the family archives and published in splendid dress by the great Florentine's descendant, Count Paolo Guicciardini (Florence, Le Monnier, pp. 123).

A life of *Carlo Felice* by F. Lemmi has been added to the collection, Biblioteca Storica Sabauda (Turin, Paravia, 1931, pp. 264).

Two works of value for the student of Austro-Italian relations, supplementing each other chronologically, are *Le Prime Strette dell' Austria in Italia* (Milan, Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, pp. 340) by S. Pugliese, which deals with the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century and *L'Assolutismo Illuminato in Austria e Lombardia,* I., *I Domini Ereditari* (Bologna, Zanichelli, 1931, pp. 292) by Franco Valsecchi, which covers the reigns of Charles VI., Maria Theresa, and Joseph II.

Popoli e Lingue nell' Alto Adige by Carlo Battisti (Florence, Bemporad, 1931, pp. xi, 401) furnishes an elaborate historical survey of the evolution of one of the moot questions in present-day Europe.

Articles: Pericle Ducati, *Lo Stato Presente degli Studi Etruschi* (N. Antol., Aug. 16); André E. Sayous, *Les Opérations des Banquiers Italiens en Italie et aux Foires de Champagne pendant le XIII^e^ Siècle* (Rev. Hist., July); Annibale Alberti, *Confidenze e Confidenti al Tempo della Serenissima* [Venetian Inquisition] (N. Antol., Aug. 1); Albert Pingaud, *Le Premier Royaume d'Italie* [V.], *L'Œuvre Intellectuelle* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., July); Enzo Tagliacozzo, *Silvio Spaventa e la Politica della Destra* [Italian internal politics in '70s and '80s] (N. Riv. Stor., Mar.); Biagio Pace, *Africa e Sicilia* [6th–19th centuries] (N. Antol., Sept. 16); Giuseppe Stefani, *Unita della Storia Istriana* (*ibid.,* Oct. 1); Roberto Levillier, *Quelques "Propositions Juridiques" et la "Destruction des Indes" du P. Las Casas, Essai de Rectification* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., May); Hedwig M. A. Fitzler, *Portugiesische Handelsgesellschaften des 15. und Beginnenden 16. Jahrhunderts* (Vierteljahr. für Soz.-u. Wirtschaftsgesch., XXV., Heft 3).

E. N. C.

NORTHERN EUROPE

An important addition to the body of source materials for Danish history are the Reventlow Papers (*Efterladte Papirer fra den Reventlowske Familiekreds*), the tenth and last volume of which has recently appeared (Copenhagen, P. Haase and Son). The Reventlow family has played an important part in Danish public life since the sixteenth century and the publication of its papers will prove of interest not only to students of Danish history but also to those who work in the history of the neighboring lands, particularly Germany. The work is edited by Louis Bobé; it has the virtue of an elaborate index.

In 1622, Christian IV., hoping to make his kingdom independent of Hamburg in certain lines of industry, invited a Jewish colony to settle in Copenhagen. The history of the Jews in this city and elsewhere in Denmark (and it is a rather drab story) has now been told by Benjamin Balslev in *De Danske Jöders Historie* (Copenhagen, Lohse).

The third and last volume of Johannes Paul's *Gustaf Adolf* has come from the press during the present year. It covers the period from Breitenfeld to Lützen (Leipzig, Quelle and Mayer).

An important contribution to the economic history of Sweden is a recent volume by Arthur Montgomery entitled *Industrialismens Genombrott i Sverige* [the rise of industrialism in Sweden] (Stockholm, Skoglund, pp. 330, 6.50 kr.).

The confiscation of feudal estates in Livonia in the latter part of the seventeenth century has been made the subject of a penetrating study by Juhan Vasar, one of the new school of historians in the Baltic lands. The author writes from the Swedish rather than from the German point of view (the despoiled landlords were nearly all German), but he has thought it expedient to publish his work in the German language: *Die Grosse Livländische Güterreduktion* (Tartu [Dorpat], 1931, pp. xxvii, 400).

Svensk Historietænkning, by Kay Schmidt-Phiseldeck, is a critical examination of the philosophic theories and points of view that have influenced scholars in Sweden and Finland in their treatment of historical problems. The author deals largely with philosophers like Höijer, Boström, and Geijer, who was both historian and philosopher; but he also presents the views of professional historians of a later generation, especially those of Ludvig Stavenow and the Finlander M. G. Schybergson. (Copenhagen, Brenner, pp. 135.)

Articles: D. B. Bjork, *The Peace of Stralsund* (Speculum, Oct.); Waldemar Westergaard, *The Hansa Towns and Scandinavia on the Eve of Swedish Independence* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.); A. Ballagi, *Zur Geschichte der Heimkehr des Karls XII. und des Schwedischen Heeres durch Ungarn* (Karolinska Förbundets Årsbok, 1931); Nils Forssell, *Omkring Karl Johans-*

tidens Statsrådsberedning [the committee of the council of state in the days of Charles John (Bernadotte)] (Historisk Tidskrift, 1932, 2); A. G. van Hamel, *On Ari's Chronology* (Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi, 1931); Ragnar Hemmer, *Svensk Rätt i Finland under Medeltiden* [Swedish law in Finland in the Middle Ages] (Nordisk Tidskrift för Vetenskap, Konst och Industri, 1932, 5); E. Despréaux, *L'Offensive de Catherine II. contre le Catholicisme en Courlande* (Rev. des Études Hist., July); Karl Stählin, *Aus den Berichten der III. Abteilung S. M. Höchsteigener Kanzlei an Kaiser Nikolaus I.* [I.] (Zeitschr. für Osteur. Gesch., 1932, Heft 4); Leonid Strahkovsky, *The Church in Contemporary Poland* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Oct.).

L. M. L.

THE FAR EAST

An introduction to the culture of the Far East is Kenneth Saunders's *The Heritage of Asia* (Macmillan, pp. 224, $1.75). By studying particularly the Guptan era in India, the T'ang period in China, the Nara age in Japan, and the teachings of Sakyamuni, Confucius, and Shokotu, the author seeks to find the characteristics of similarity and difference in these lands. In the latter part of the book are found illustrative readings from the literature of the three countries.

By the addition of some twenty pages of new material to his chapter on the Struggle for Democracy, Mr. E. T. Williams in the recent, fifth edition of his *China Yesterday and Today* (Thomas Y. Crowell, pp. xxiv, 743, $4.00), brings the discussion of the political situation in China up to May, 1932. Several sections on such questions as the opium trade, extraterritoriality, and currency reform have also been revised in view of recent developments. Other new pages of bibliography, chronology, and the tables in the appendix help to continue the great usefulness of this standard work.

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

General review: Melvin M. Knight, *L'Aspect Européen d'Histoire Économique des États-Unis* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., May).

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: additional photostats of letters of George Washington; the "Gregg Collection", papers of Frederick A. Muhlenberg, Gen. Joseph Hiester, and Andrew Gregg, 1715, 1773–1830, 57 pieces; four papers of Thomas Jefferson respecting the sale of his library to Congress; correspondence of John Randolph of Roanoke and James M. Garnett, 1806–1822, copies, one volume; letters and papers (18) of Benjamin Lundy, 1814–1849; photostats of 54 papers, mainly letters of Lewis Tappan, 1828–1872; photostats of 63 letters of James Buchanan and others to George Plitt, 1836–

1859; an additional volume of letters to Thomas Ewing, 1858–1860; the papers of Andrew Carnegie, a large collection; photocopies from the Public Archives of Canada of correspondence of the governor-general and other Canadian governors with the British minister to the United States, more than 10,000 pages, and many other photocopies from London, Paris, and Seville.

The Department of State has issued as publication no. 382 a *List of Treaties submitted to the Senate, 1789–1931, which have not gone into force.* Among the interesting problems discussed in the prefatory remarks is the question when a treaty may be considered defunct, rather than still pending. There is a supplementary list of six "Treaties awaiting further Proceedings". Full notes offer needed explanations of the fate of various treaties.

The story of American mines from colonial days to the present time is told by T. A. Rickard in a volume entitled *A History of American Mining* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. xii, 419, $3.00). It belongs to a series sponsored by the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, and is intended to give practical engineers some account of the historical background of their professional work.

Dr. Frank Monaghan's Bibliographical List of French Travellers in the United States, 1765–1931, is completed by the publication of part VII. in the October *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library.

The essay on *Grossbritannien und die Vereinigten Staaten: Ihr Machtpolitisches Verhältnis vom Amerikanischen Unabhängigkeitskrieg bis zum Weltkrieg,* by Max Silberschmidt, Privatdozent in the University of Zurich (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, pp. 82), offers no new material to the discussion of the subject. It is drawn principally from general works like Morison's *Oxford History of the United States,* written primarily for English students of American history, the *Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy,* Dunning's volume on Anglo-American relations, with the use of maybe a half dozen special monographs; but omitting significant works by Henry Adams, Dexter Perkins, Julius Pratt, Lester B. Shippee, etc. Other important studies are mentioned in the bibliography but not used in the text. S. F. B.

M. Daniel Walther's dissertation entitled *Gouverneur Morris, Témoin de Deux Révolutions* (University of Geneva, pp. 307), adds materially to our knowledge of Morris's career in France, through a careful examination of the letters and papers preserved in the Department of State and the archives of the French ministry of foreign affairs. In chapter VIII., with the title of Témoin des Grandes Journées, M. Walther quotes at length from Morris's dispatches. He has also consulted letters preserved in such collections as those of the Library of Congress, the Huntington Library, and the New York Public Library. He appreciates at its just value Morris's testimony on the French Revolution, although he constantly emphasizes Morris's strong sympathies

with the aristocracy. Apropos of M. Aulard's characterization of Morris's comments on the Revolution as "radotage prétentieux" M. Walther remarks that after all Morris "a de bons yeux". The volume also deals with the part which he played in the American Revolution, and gives his later history.

The volume of Dr. Donald G. Tewksbury on *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities before the Civil War, with Particular Reference to the Religious Influences bearing upon the College Movement* (Teachers College, Columbia University, pp. x, 254, $2.50) is extraordinarily successful in presenting the results of research in a form of maximum utility. One of its important contributions is a list of such institutions, including their charter-degree date, their religious connection, and changes of name. The dates are carefully checked from legal or other official records. This list is supplemented by lists for each denomination. Maps also display to the eye similar facts. Table II. exhibits the mortality of such institutions. Arkansas and Florida hold the record, 100 per cent., while Kansas and Texas follow with 95 per cent. The total for the sixteen states represented is 81 per cent. As the title of the first chapter, The Moving Frontier and the American College, suggests, the author believes that the American college "was designed primarily to meet the needs of pioneer communities, and was established in most cases on the frontier line of settlement".

The main purpose of the handsome volume on *Yale in the Civil War,* by Ellsworth Eliot, jr. (Yale University Press, pp. xiv, 222, many plates, $5.00), is to give the Roll of Honor, the list of men, with their records, who served either in the Union or the Confederate army. It includes, however, material of historical interest even for those beyond the circle of Yale graduates. The second chapter explains the attitude of the undergraduates toward the war, and reveals an astonishing apathy. There was no such eagerness to enlist as characterized the student body in 1917. It is true that nearly one-half of the class of 1861, and one-third of the classes of 1862 and 1863 enlisted, but with very few exceptions they waited until graduation. The author feels that the student mind was ignorant and confused in regard to the issues of the conflict. He remarks that this was due in part to lack of instruction in subjects like history and economics.

In *Back Stage in 1912: the Inside Story of the Split Republican Convention,* by Victor Rosewater, formerly editor of the Omaha *Daily Bee* (Dorrance and Company, pp. xi, 227, $2.00), is found the story of the 1912 Republican National Convention, written by one behind the scenes. As chairman of the Republican National Committee it fell to Mr. Rosewater's lot to call the stormy convention of that year to order and to wield the gavel till a temporary organization could be accomplished. He made decisions which aroused violent protests and denunciations from the faction that opposed him. He tells of the long struggle over contested seats in "the most acrimonious meetings

of the National Committee in its whole history"; of the Taft-Roosevelt feud; of the "steam roller" and "gag rule"; and of the efforts of the Roosevelt forces "to purge the roll of the fraudulent delegates placed there by the national committee". He presents interesting pen pictures of the convention leaders and he introduces some amusing fiction created by inventive journalists of the time. The book is concisely and clearly written and it presents in judicial tone an important chapter in our party history. It may be said that he makes out a good case for the defense, and that as a presiding officer he acted then, as he writes now, with dignity, fairness, and good temper. J. A. W.

Hon. James M. Beck in *Our Wonderland of Bureaucracy* (Macmillan, pp. xv, 272, $3.00) traces the development of bureaucracy in our government from colonial days, in order to give more force to his indictment of it as a dangerous departure from the aims of the constitution and a menace to the liberty of the individual.

Money in Elections, by Louise Overacker, associate professor of political science, Wellesley College (Macmillan Company, pp. xiii, 476, $3.50), is a substantial contribution in a field of research sufficiently new to possess unusual interest. The devious systems of bookkeeping used by political machines and party candidates make it a formidable task to study the financial side of modern elections with the hope of profitable results. The author leaves hardly a stone unturned in her determination to obtain all records and information pertinent to the investigation. Miss Overacker is willing to admit the conjectural nature of many of her conclusions. Her proposals of legislative change to control the collection and expenditure of money in political campaigns have either yet to be tried or have never been given a fair opportunity in their present application. The documentation and bibliography are full. Much of the material for this study was collected by the late Victor J. West, of Stanford University. C. M. F.

The International Joint Commission between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, by Chirakaikaran Joseph Chacko, Ph.D. [Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, no. 358] (Columbia University Press, pp. 431, $5.50), is a valuable, clearly written, and exhaustive study of the body which was set up by treaty in 1909. In the first twenty years of its existence, it successfully reviewed six cases in its capacity as an investigating and conciliating body, and nineteen cases in its judicial capacity. Here is a record of common sense and solid achievement in the international field of which citizens of the United States and Canada may well be proud. Dr. Chacko has reported the proceedings of the commission in detail, as a judicial, administrative, investigative, and arbitral body. In its control over frontier waters, it has been concerned not only with matters of navigation, but also with fishing and wrecking privileges, sanitation, and power projects. The commission's report on the St. Lawrence waterway and power project has

become fairly well known, but the reader will be surprised to discover in how many other cases this body has quietly and with little publicity, found just and common sense solutions. C. W.

We commonly wait a decade or two for collections of source material on even a great crisis. The volume of *Walter Lippmann's Interpretations, 1931–1932,* edited by Allan Nevins (Macmillan, pp. x, 361, $2.50), is therefore especially welcome for it enables the reader to see a group of fateful months as a whole, through the eyes of a notable observer. The articles originally appeared in the *Herald Tribune,* and have been selected and arranged under eleven general headings by another wise interpreter, Professor Nevins. An index helps to make the contents practically usable.

Articles: Ethel Owen Merrill, *Henri de Tonty* (Mid-America, Oct.); Albert M. Goodrich and Grace Lee Nute, *The Radisson Problem* (Minnesota Hist., Sept.); Cyrus H. Karraker, *A Treasure Expedition of William Phips* (New Eng. Quar., Oct.); V. D. Harrington, *The Merchant in Colonial Life* (New York Hist., Oct.); Christopher B. Coleman, *George Washington in the West* (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Sept.); Moses Bigelow, *Chronological Survey of the Operations of the Continental Army* (Proc. of the New Jersey Hist. Soc., Oct.); Elizabeth S. Kite, *General Duportail at Valley Forge* (Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Everett D. Obrecht, *The Influence of Luther Martin in the Making of the Constitution of the United States* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Sept.); George E. Hastings, *Jacob Duché, First Chaplain of Congress* (South Atlantic Quar., Oct.); Victor J. Albjerg, *Internal Improvements without a Policy, 1789–1861* (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Sept.); R. L. Morrow, *The Early American Attitude toward the Doctrine of Expatriation* (Am. Jour. of International Law, July); Dudley W. Knox, *The "Adams" Men-of-War* [history of vessels named for John Adams, 1798–1920] (U. S. Naval Inst. Proc., Nov.); H. I. Chapelle, *The Ships of the American Navy in the War of 1812* (Mariner's Mirror, July); Louis C. Duncan, *Sketches of the Medical Service in the War of 1812* [I.] (Military Surgeon, Nov.); M. L. Bonham, jr., *A Postscript to the Founding of New Madrid* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); J. A. James, *Oliver Pollock and the Free Navigation of the Mississippi River* (*ibid.*); Marie J. Kohnova, *The Moravians and their Missionaries: a Problem in Americanization* (*ibid.*); H. Donaldson Jordan, *A Politician of Expansion : Robert J. Walker* (*ibid.*); P. G. Auchampaugh, *The Buchanan-Douglas Feud* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Apr.-July); Earle D. Ross, *Northern Sectionalism in the Civil War Era* (Iowa Jour. of Hist. and Pol., Oct.); J. G. Randall, *John Sherman and Reconstruction* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Joseph Schafer, *Some Enduring Factors in Rural Polity* (Agric. Hist., Oct.); T. A. Bailey, *The World Cruise of the American Battleship Fleet,* (Pac. Hist. Rev., Dec.); H. J. Coppock, *Herbert Levi Osgood* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.).

Documents: A. L. Crabb, ed., *George Washington and the Chickasaw Nation, 1795* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); *Bamford's Diary: the Revolutionary Diary of a British Officer* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Sept.).

NEW ENGLAND

The more important additions to the manuscript collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society during the past two years are as follows: the business and shipping papers of the Morse family of Boston and Massachusetts, covering their commercial relations with various parts of the world in the early part of the last century; similar papers of James and Thomas H. Perkins, 1803–1857, of Boston; and of James and Thomas Lamb, and Thomas Lamb, jr., of Boston, 1790–1865; the papers of the late Major-General Clarence R. Edwards, preserved by him since 1899; and an interesting volume of letters written by the Reverend Samuel Mather, of Boston, to his son Samuel, commissary of Fort Edward and of Quebec, and later a refugee in England, relating to important affairs in Boston from 1759 to 1785.

The Massachusetts Historical Society is preparing the third volume of the *Winthrop Papers* covering the years 1631–1633, together with the journal of John Winthrop for that period. This volume will be published in 1934. The fourth volume of Sibley's *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University* will appear in 1933. This volume, which continues the work of the late John Langdon Sibley, librarian of Harvard College, will contain biographies of all graduates and temporary students for the years 1689–1700 inclusive. A fifth volume is now in preparation. Volume XIV. of the *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts* (1736–1737) will be published in the spring. These volumes appear annually and will ultimately contain all the Journals of the House from 1715 to 1776.

The Colonial Society of Massachusetts is publishing in two volumes the *Records of the Suffolk County Court, 1670–1680,* edited by Zechariah Chafee and Samuel Eliot Morison. The cases are illustrated with many documents from the court files, making these volumes the most notable documentary publication in colonial legal history for many years.

The General Society of Mayflower Descendants has published the *Mayflower Index* containing (pt. I.) the names of persons descended from a Mayflower Pilgrim, and (pt. II.) the names of husbands or wives of these descendants. The compiler is William Alexander McAuslan, historian general, 9 Ashburton Place, Boston.

A substantial addition to the history of early Massachusetts settlers is made in the volume entitled *Davis Families of Early Roxbury and Boston,* by Samuel Forbes Rockwell (North Andover, pp. xii, 314). It brings the record down to 1700, although one or two lines have been brought forward to the present time. It is provided with a bibliography and a full index.

The Connecticut Historical Society has recently acquired more than fifty letters written by Rev. Benjamin Trumbull, the historian of Connecticut, to his wife while he was in Revolutionary War service in 1775 and 1776. Accompanying these are seven letters from Martha Trumbull to her husband, Rev. Benjamin Trumbull, during the same years. Also several miscellaneous letters, including one from General David Wooster. At the same time the society also acquired "Memorandums, Minutes, etc., of a miscellaneous kind made in the camp 1775". These memorandums, made by Rev. Benjamin Trumbull, are in the nature of a diary, showing the camp life and events from day to day.

The Connecticut Historical Society in conjunction with the Society of Mayflower Descendants in Connecticut published last October the *Records of the Congregational Church in Canterbury, Connecticut, 1711–1844* (Hartford, the Society, pp. 229, $4.00). Besides the usual official minutes, the volume contains entries of births, marriages, and deaths. The index is full, with 7200 references.

In *The Charter of Connecticut: a Study* (Hartford, the Society, pp. 72) Mr. Albert C. Bates, secretary of the Connecticut Historical Society, gives the history of the Connecticut charters from the so-called Warwick patent through the crisis of the Andros régime. One of the most interesting parts of his essay is his analysis of the evidence upon which rests the traditional story of the Charter Oak episode. Incidentally he endeavors to prove that the meeting with Andros did not take place in Sanford's tavern, the site of which is now commemorated by a tablet, but in "the court-town-school house on the south side of what is now Sheldon street". Mr. Bates adds the subsequent history of the charter and of the "duplicate" charter.

The recollections of a childhood and youth in Maine in the decades between 1890 and 1910 are most happily told by Miss Mary Ellen Chase in her recent book *A Goodly Heritage* (Henry Holt, pp. 298, $3.00). She writes of her family, home life, religious training—still vigorously Puritanic even in the '90s—and of her schooling, "before education became an 'experiment' ", at the Academy and at the University of Maine, with vividness, understanding, and humor. Except for the sea-faring tradition which made a New England village unique, such environment and training as Miss Chase describes are probably what millions of Americans experienced whose years now "fall between thirty and seventy". Her story, therefore, takes on some significance as social history.

Article: Fulmer Mood, *An Astrologer from Down East* (New Eng. Quar., Oct.).

Documents and letters: *A Record of Entrances and Clearances of the Port of Salem, 1750–1769* [cont'd] (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., Oct.); *Letters of Samuel Dalton of Salem, an Impressed American Seaman, 1803–1814* (*ibid.*).

Philipse Manor Hall, in Yonkers, is one of the most historic houses in America. It is believed to have been begun in 1682, by the first Frederick Philipse, lord of the manor of Philipsborough. It is the property of New York, and the custodian is the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society. This interesting monument has just been thoroughly renovated as the result of the allocation of $10,000 by the relief administration of the state to increase employment. It was reopened to the public on November 21.

The New Yorkers of half a century ago did not imagine that the Rogers groups would one day become important sources of information upon American social interests and costumes. It is from this point of view that the New York Historical Society is seeking to complete a collection, which already amounts to sixty-one pieces or three-fourths of all that John Rogers produced.

A Pennsylvania Historical Convention met at State College on September 15–17 under the auspices of the State Historical Commission and the Federation of Historical Societies. At the business meeting it was decided to form a Pennsylvania Historical Association. The temporary officers chosen were instructed to take the necessary steps.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has received a large collection of material relating to General George Gordon Meade, including the original manuscript of his *Life and Letters,* compiled by his son, George Meade, and edited by his grandson, George Gordon Meade; maps and coast surveys used by General Meade during the Mexican and Civil wars; original maps, sketches, and surveys of the engineer corps used during the Civil War; official letters and papers of General Meade covering the Civil War period; personal letters to his family; letters referring to the Battle of Gettysburg; newspaper cuttings (1863–1872), obituary notices, and letters referring to him.

Among other additions to the collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania are a number of account books, cash books, ledgers, etc., covering the latter part of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries: (1) a ledger of William Bird beginning May, 1741, when he kept a store in Amity Township (now in Berks County) and managed Pine Forge; (2) a ledger of William Bird beginning May, 1744, which shows expenses incurred in building Hopewell Forge in Union Township (now in Berks County); (3) Berkshire Furnace Day Book, the first entry being April, 1787; (4) a ledger of the "New Furnace", or Reading Furnace (Berks County), commencing March 1, 1792.

Recent additions to collections of the Western Pennsylvania Historical Survey and the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania include the papers of William G. Hawkins, a Pennsylvania legislator and attorney of the early

nineteenth century; a large collection of transcripts of early church and borough records of western Pennsylvania; the office file of the Pittsburgh *Christian Advocate,* official organ of the Pittsburgh Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from 1833 to 1930; and large quantities of material relating to the Hungarian and Polish elements in the United States.

Special collection projects under way include the making of transcripts of all documents relating to western Pennsylvania in the Bouquet Papers from the photostats in the possession of the Library of Congress and the building up of as complete a file as possible of the Pittsburgh *Gazette* from its founding in 1786 to 1820 by assembling photostats of copies in libraries throughout the country. Research projects under way include a study of "Western Pennsylvania Politics, 1788–1824" by Dr. R. J. Ferguson; "Indian Affairs of the Upper Ohio Valley, 1774–95" by Dr. R. C. Downes; and "Early Transportation in Western Pennsylvania" by Dr. L. D. Baldwin. Dr. Alfred P. James, who was research associate on the staff of the Survey for 1931–1932, spent the summer in England and France searching for and listing materials on the early history of western Pennsylvania.

The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania and the summer session of the University of Pittsburgh fittingly celebrated the Washington Bicentennial by joining in an expedition on July 15 and 16 over the trail which the youthful Washington followed in 1753 on his journey to Fort Le Bœuf. Incidentally other historic spots of the western frontier were visited. The pilgrimage terminated at Erie. An interesting account is published in the October number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine.*

Arthur Pound continues his studies of the personages of the colonial period in a volume entitled *The Penns of Pennsylvania and England* (Macmillan, pp. xx, 349, $3.50). It is divided into three books: Penn the Sailor, Penn the Quaker, and The Later Penns. The interest naturally centers upon the founder of Pennsylvania, although the sketch of Admiral Penn is well drawn. Mr. Pound has a vivid sense of the dramatic moments in the relations between this fighting Briton and his Quaker son. He also points out again and again that William Penn inherited much of his father's belligerent spirit, and showed it in the defense of his rights against the oppressors of the day. The later chapters make the volume, as the author intended, an instructive study of the fate of a great family, an essay in multibiography.

Articles: C. E. Bennett, *The Burning of Schenectady* [Feb. 8, 1689/1690] (New York History, Oct.); R. W. Anthony, *Schenectady, 1769–1775* (*ibid.*); John Pell, *The Saga of Will Gilliland* (*ibid.*); Robert G. Albion, *Yankee Domination of New York Port* (New Eng. Quar., Oct.); Edward S. Rankin, *The Ramapo Tract* (Proc. of the New Jersey Hist. Soc., Oct.); Harrold E. Gillingham, *Philadelphia's First Fire Defences* (Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Harold S. Bender, *The Literature and Hymnology of the*

Mennonites of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (Mennonite Quar., July); J. Cutler Andrews, *The Pittsburgh Gazette: a Pioneer Newspaper* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Nov.).

Documents, papers, and letters: *Journal of Lieut. Rufus Wheeler of Rowley, Fort Ticonderoga, July 23 to December 10, 1776* (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., Oct.); Dr. Amos Canfield, ed., *Town Records of Newtown, Long Island* (New York Geneal. and Biog. Record, Oct.); Chester T. Hallenbeck, ed., *A Colonial Reading List* [from Loan Books, 1762–1787, of the Union Library, Hatboro, Pennsylvania] (Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Elizabeth M. Sellers, ed., *Selections from the Letter Book of John Thaw, 1804–1808* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Nov.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The *Second Annual Report* (1931–1932) of Dr. Lester J. Cappon, archivist of the University of Virginia Library, describes the progress made in the survey and collection of manuscript and other historical materials in Virginia. The archives and other manuscript records, public and private, were inventoried in the following counties: Isle of Wight, Norfolk, Stafford, and York (in Tidewater); Goochland and Orange (Piedmont); Augusta and Botetourt (Valley); and Washington (Southwest). The wide variety of records included and, in some cases, collected for the university library, is revealed in the list of acquisitions (p. 4). Some discussion of the data compiled through questionnaires to fraternal organizations indicates the inclusion of material for social history. An inventory of newspaper files throughout the state, including those in editors' offices, will be published first, according to present plans. The desire of the university to promote a coöperative spirit in the collection of manuscripts is emphasized, in order to further the work of preservation and to insure, as far as possible, the accessibility of these materials for research.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has received as an addition to the Marmaduke J. Hawkins Collection 279 letters, 1812–1905, dealing with textile manufacturers as well as politics, and as additions to the Crabtree Jones Collection 65 letters and papers, 1826–1873, and an account book of N. Jones and Company, 1790–1794. Other accessions are volumes of administrators' and guardians' bonds, 1827–1846, from Currituck County, and of marriage bonds from Stokes and Randolph counties.

In view of the fact that the North Carolina Historical Commission publishes a quarterly devoted to North Carolina history, the North Carolina *Historical and Genealogical Record* announces the policy of emphasizing genealogy and source material bearing upon that field in its numbers beginning with January, 1933.

The second section of *A Checklist of United States Newspapers* (*and*

Weeklies before 1900) *in the General Library of Duke University* covers the states from Idaho to Massachusetts inclusive. The compilers are Mary Westcott and Allene Ramage, and an introduction is contributed by Professor W. K. Boyd.

Mr. Burton Barrs has published in revised form a paper contributed to the Jacksonville History Society, entitled *East Florida in the American Revolution.*

Professor E. C. Barker, aided by grants from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Fund and the University of Texas, has been engaged for the past two years in compiling and editing the letters, papers, and speeches of Sam Houston. The material has already attained the proportions of approximately 5000 typewritten pages. As Houston was a prolific letter writer, his literary remains are widely scattered and many letters may be in the hands of collectors. Professor Barker will appreciate receiving copies of Houston material or information concerning the whereabouts of such documents.

Articles: William J. Hinke, *The 1714 Colony of Germanna, Virginia* [I.] (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Arthur G. Peterson, *The Old Alexandria-Georgetown Canal and Potomac Aqueduct* (*ibid.*); Herbert Thatcher, *Dr.* [*John*] *Mitchell, M. D., F. R. S., of Virginia* [IV.] (*ibid.*); Lyon G. Tyler, *Arthur Lee: a Neglected Statesman* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); I. N. Carr, *Mars Hill College in the War between the States* (North Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Rec., Oct.); J. G. Johnson, *Notes on Manufacturing in Ante-Bellum Georgia* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Sept.); Peter S. McGuire, *The Railroads of Georgia, 1860–1880* (*ibid.*); Laura L. Porteous (with occasional notes by Henry P. Dart), *Index to Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana* [Feb., 1781], XXXVII. (Louisiana Hist. Quar., Oct.); Robert D. Calhoun, *A History of Concordia Parish, Louisiana* [IV.] (*ibid.*); G. P. Whittington, *Rapides Parish, Louisiana: a History,* chs. I.-III. (*ibid.*); Lane C. Kendall, *John McDonough, Slave-Owner* [I.] (*ibid.*); James E. Winston, *New Orleans Newspapers and the Texas Question, 1835–1837* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Oct.); W. Darrell Overdyke, *History of the American Party in Louisiana,* ch. I. (Louisiana Hist. Quar., Oct.); Harriet Smither, *The Alabama Indians of Texas* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Oct.).

Documents, papers, letters: *Letters from Lawrence Butler* [cont'd, 1786] (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Oct.); *Lower Norfolk County Records, 1636–1646* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); David R. Barbee, ed., *Letters on the Issues of 1850–1865* [letters of George W. Woodward, George Ashmun, Thurlow Weed, Allan B. Magruder, Stephen A. Douglas, and others] (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); Theodore D. Jervey, ed., *Garth Correspondence* [cont'd] (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); Mabel L. Webber, ed., *Josiah Smith's Diary, 1780–1781* (*ibid.*); Henry P. Dart, ed.,

Albert G. Sanders, translator, *Documents concerning the Crozat Régime in Louisiana, 1712–1717* [I.] (Louisiana Hist. Quar., Oct.); Henry P. Dart, ed., Laura L. Porteous, translator, *Sanitary Conditions in New Orleans under the Spanish Régime, 1799–1800* (*ibid.*); Henry P. Dart, ed., Heloise H. Cruzat, translator, *Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana,* LV. [May, 1746] (*ibid.*); James K. Greer, ed., *The Diary of James Buckner Barry* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Oct.); Harriet Smither, ed., *Diary of Adolphus Sterne,* XXV. (*ibid.*).

WESTERN STATES

As a part of its educational program the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society has recently issued an illustrated booklet entitled *The Story of Ohio as Told by a Museum Exhibit,* by Dr. Harlow Lindley, curator of history.

Oberlin College Library has issued as one of its series of bulletins *A Classified Catalogue of the Collection of Anti-Slavery Propaganda in the Oberlin College Library,* compiled by Geraldine Hopkins Hubbard and edited by Julian S. Fowler. Mr. Fowler has contributed an account of the manner in which the collection has been brought together. It now includes about seventeen hundred items. The catalogue entries are frequently accompanied by illuminating descriptive notes.

The new building of the Chicago Historical Society, situated in Lincoln Park, was opened to the public on November 12.

Vol. X., no. 2, of the University of Iowa Studies in the Social Sciences is entitled *Abstracts in History* and summarizes twelve theses presented to the Graduate College for the degree of Ph.D. (Iowa City, the University, pp. 170).

The University of Michigan has undertaken to make a collection of materials relating to Judge Thomas M. Cooley, with a view to an adequate biography of the noted jurist, and would appreciate information concerning the whereabouts of such materials. The chairman of the committee having the matter in charge is Professor John S. Worley.

As a result of the searches of Justice William W. Potter of the Michigan Supreme Court, who is writing a *History of the Michigan Bench and Bar,* the files of the Territorial Supreme Court through the whole of the Territorial period have been discovered, and steps are being taken to have these records properly edited and published. Contributory to this discovery were the researches of Shelby B. Schurz of Grand Rapids.

The William L. Clements Library plans to publish the letters of Henry Gladwin, commandant at Detroit at the time of the siege, 1763, together with an accompanying narrative of events at the time the letters were written, for which the known sources of information respecting the siege will be drawn upon. There are thirty-six known letters of Gladwin, of which the Clements

Library possesses twenty-seven (found among the papers of Thomas Gage), and of the thirty-six only four have been printed.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has received a substantial body of documents bearing upon the history of the Brothertown Indian tribe, some of the material relating to the affairs of the tribe while it was still located in New York. The other papers refer to tribal history in Wisconsin from the time of the arrival of these Indians down to the Civil War.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has decided to publish an index of the first fifteen volumes of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*. It has also authorized the preparation of a calendar of the George Rogers Clark Papers in the Draper Collection. This volume will constitute vol. IV. in the calendar series.

Among recent accessions to the Minnesota Historical Society, as recorded in the September issue of *Minnesota History*, are: the papers of Commodore William F. Davidson, containing valuable material on Mississippi River steamboating, railroads, banking, insurance, etc.; and transcripts of numerous letters of the correspondence between missionaries among the Sioux and their superiors in Boston (1851–1862).

The State Historical Society of Colorado has recently acquired over 300 original "Claim Club" papers, comprising farm and townsite claims of the period of earliest settlement in the state. A collection of about 500 early books and pamphlets pertaining to Colorado and the Rocky Mountain West have come to the society from the late Frank L. Woodward. Included are three rare guidebooks to the Pike's Peak Gold Country (1859). The society is actively gathering files of early newspapers throughout the state, including some issued in mining boom towns now "ghost cities". The marking of historic sites is progressing rapidly. The society prepares the legend, furnishing a standardized bronze tablet, while local organizations provide the monument.

The Village of the Great Kivas on the Zuñi Reservation, New Mexico, by Frank H. H. Roberts, is the subject of Bulletin no. 111, Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution.

Indian Labor in the Spanish Colonies, by Ruth K. Barber, which has been appearing in the *New Mexico Historical Review*, has now been printed as vol. VI. of the Publications in History of the Historical Society of New Mexico.

With its January number the *Arizona Historical Review* will begin the publication of three books: the *Autobiography of George Wiley Paul Hunt*, seven times governor of Arizona; the *History of Phoenix: a Relation of its Pioneer Days and People*, by James M. Barney; and *Arizona Place-Names*, by Will C. Barnes, containing the origin and location of 4000 names. Publication as books will follow the appearance of these works in the quarterly. It is

also hoped to publish in book form Professor H. K. Wyllys's *Kino of Pimeria Alta,* which is now appearing in the quarterly.

Articles: Lucien Beckner, *Eskippakithiki: the Last Indian Town in Kentucky* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Oct.); Adin Baber, *Early Trails of Eastern Illinois* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Apr.-July); Edwin Davis, *Lincoln and Macon County, Illinois, 1830–1831* (*ibid.*); Charles B. Davis, *Judge James Hawkins Peck* [*ca.* 1790–1836] (Missouri Hist. Rev., Oct.); Monas N. Squires, *A New View of the Election of Barton and Benton to the United States Senate in 1820* (*ibid.*); Wilfred B. Shaw, *The Early Days of the University of Michigan: Some Sidelights from the Correspondence of Silas H. Douglass, first Professor of Chemistry at the University* (Michigan Hist. Mag., Autumn); William Stetson Merrill, *Catholic Historical Markers in Michigan* (Mid-America, Oct.); James B. Weaver, *The Story of the "Des Moines River Lands"* (Annals of Iowa, Oct.); Jacob A. Swisher, *The Career of Cyrus Bussey* (Iowa Jour. of Hist. and Pol., Oct.); Herman J. Deutsch, [Matt H.] *Carpenter and the Senatorial Election of 1875 in Wisconsin* (Wisconsin Mag. of Hist., Sept.); Dorothy Ganfield, *The Influence of Wisconsin on Federal Politics, 1880–1907* (*ibid.*); William J. Petersen, *Steamboating in the Upper Mississippi Fur Trade* (Minnesota Hist., Sept.); Esther Jerabek, *Antonín Jurka, a Pioneer Czech Schoolmaster in Minnesota* (*ibid.*); Arthur Ridgway, *The Mission of Colorado Toll Roads* (Colorado Mag., Sept.); LeRoy R. Hafen, *Colorado Cities: their Founding and their Names* (*ibid.*); Walker D. Wyman, *Bullwhacking: a Prosaic Profession Peculiar to the Great Plains* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Oct.); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *The Beginnings of Printing in Arizona: with a Preliminary Check-List of Arizona Book and Pamphlet Imprints, 1860–1875* (Arizona Hist. Rev., Oct.); John B. Meserve, *The MacIntoshes* [from Scotland through Georgia to Oklahoma] (Chron. of Oklahoma, Sept.); Joseph B. Thoburn, *Washington Irving's Tour on the Prairies* [1832] (*ibid.*); Adele Ogden, *The Californias in Spain's Pacific Otter Trade, 1775–1795* (Pac. Hist. Rev., Dec.); Charles H. Carey, *Lee, Waller, and McLoughlin* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Sept.); J. Neilson Barry, *Oregon Boundaries* (*ibid.*); Edmund T. Coleman, *Puget Sound and the Northern Pacific Railroad* (Washington Hist. Quar., Oct.); Alfred Tunem, *The Dispute over the San Juan Islands Water Boundary* [cont'd] (*ibid.*).

Documents, papers, letters: Ludie K. Kinkhead, ed., *Minute Book, no. 1., Jefferson County, Kentucky, 1784–1785* [pt. 4, Sept.-Dec., 1785] (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Oct.); Charles R. Staples, ed., *History in Circuit Court Records, Fayette County* [cont'd] (Reg. of the Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Oct.); Mrs. Jouett Taylor Cannon, ed., *General Expenditures of Government, 1792–1798* (*ibid.*); Arthur Homer Hays, ed., *Diary of Taylor N. Snow, Hoosier Fifty-niner* (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Sept.); Joseph Schafer, ed., *La Pointe Letters* [letters of Florantha Thompson Sproat, 1838–1842] (Wisconsin Mag. of

Hist., Sept.); Grant Foreman, ed., *An Unpublished Report by Captain Bonneville* (Chron. of Oklahoma, Sept.); Colonel C. C. Smith, ed., *Some Unpublished History of the Southwest* [Diary of Mrs. Granville Oury, cont'd] (Arizona Hist. Rev., Oct.).

CANADA

General review: W. P. M. Kennedy, *Some Aspects of British Constitutional Law* (Can. Hist. Rev., Sept.).

The *Twentieth Report* (1931) of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, by Alexander Fraser, LL.D. (Toronto, pp. ix, 222), continues the publication of land grants bearing dates from July 1, 1797, to July 13, 1798. It also includes further grants recorded in an appendix of Land Book "C", which run from June 29 to July 4, 1796.

The Fred Morgan Kirby Lectures delivered at Lafayette College in 1931 by Professor W. P. M. Kennedy, of the University of Toronto, are entitled *Some Aspects of the Theories and Workings of Constitutional Law* (Macmillan, pp. xiv, 142, $1.50). They deal with Canadian institutions from four points of view: The State and the Law; Theories of Law and the Constitutional Law of the British Empire; Law and Custom in the Canadian Constitution; and Some Problems in the Workings of Canadian Political Institutions.

Vol. XXVIII. of the *Papers and Records* of the Ontario Historical Society (Toronto, the Society, pp. 339, $2.00) ranges widely over the field of Canadian history. The most considerable essay, making up half of the volume, deals with the Genesis of the Canada Act, and is contributed by Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank.

The Public Archives of Canada have issued vol. II. of their *Catalogue of Pamphlets*. This volume covers the years 1878–1931, with 5812 entries. It has been prepared by the librarian, Magdalen Casey, and published under the direction of the dominion archivist, Arthur G. Doughty. There are author and subject indexes. The price is $1.00.

The province of New Brunswick now possesses a museum, recently built in Saint John, which, in the value of its collections of books, documents, and prints, ranks next in importance to the Public Archives of Ottawa. The formal opening will be deferred until 1934, to mark the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of New Brunswick as a distinct government.

Articles: Georges Robitaille, *Montcalm et ses Historiens* (Le Canada Français, Nov.); Dallas D. Irvine, *The Newfoundland Fishery: a French objective in the War of American Independence* (Can. Hist. Rev., Sept.); W. S. Wallace, *Namesakes in the Fur-Trade* (*ibid.*); W. N. Sage, *The Critical Period of British Columbia History, 1866–1871* (Pac. Hist. Rev., Dec.).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

Nos. 1–6 of año XXX. of the *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* of Cuba contain an article on the history of the Cuban periodical press, as well as an index to the royal Spanish orders concerning Cuba for 1797, and a continuation of the calendar of the archives of the bureau of the Cuban revolutionary party in New York City, 1892–1896.

The *Academia de la Historia de Cuba* has published an address by Juan M. Dihigo y Mestre on Francisco Mateo de Acosta y Zenea, a Cuban Orientalist. Vol. V. of the *Colección de Documentos,* published by the same academy, contains an installment of the proceedings of the assembly of representatives and of the council of government of Cuba during the war for independence, 1898–1899.

The *Memoria de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores* of Mexico for 1931–1932 (Mexico, 1932) contains a convenient list of the treaties and conventions in force between Mexico and other states, as well as a summary of the personnel of its diplomatic representation abroad.

In *Retablo Colonial* (Caracas, 1931) Colonel Santos Jurado published a series of brief, historical essays, with bibliography, on topics in Venezuelan colonial history. Among those sketches dealing with the revolutionary period, perhaps the most useful is that describing the Venezuelan acknowledgment of allegiance to Ferdinand VII. in 1808.

Among the items in no. 58, vol. XVI., of the *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de la Historia* of Venezuela, is one by N. E. Navarro on the Franciscans in colonial Venezuela. This number also contains an installment of documents regarding the public services of General José de la Cruz Paredes, besides inedited documents concerning Andrés Bello and Simón Bolívar. No. 58 of this bulletin contains, as well as other Cruz Paredes documents, an inedited letter respecting the assassination of General Antonio José de Sucre.

Among other items, nos. 218–223 of the *Boletín de Historia y Antigüedades* (Mar.-Aug., 1932) of the Colombian Academy of History contain material on the following topics: the historical writer, Fernández de Piedrahita; the trial of D'Evereux, commander of the Irish Legion; the policy of General Francisco de Paula Santander; the revolutionary martyrs of 1816; the tomb of Francisco A. Zea; essays on Colombian worthies by Eduardo Posada; and an account of General José M. Cordova, by Laureano García Ortiz.

The *Anales de la Universidad Central* of Quito, vol. XLVIII., no. 280 (Apr.-June, 1932) contains an address delivered by Dr. Pío Jaramillo Alvarado on the occasion of the celebration of the centenary of the birth of the Ecuadorean writer, Juan Montalvo.

Nicolás Espinosa Cordero of Cuenca, Ecuador, has recently had published

a volume entitled *Historia de España en América* (Com. Ib. Am., Madrid, 1931), which was awarded a prize of 50,000 pesetas in a literary contest arranged by the Spanish journal, *A B C*.

Vergniaud Leconte fills a serious gap in the literature on the island of Santo Domingo by his *Henri Christophe dans l'Histoire d'Haïti* (Berger-Levrault, Paris, 1931).

Articles: Ed. Clavery, *Les Archives du Général Miranda* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., July); A. C. Wilgus, *The Third International American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, 1906* (Hisp. Amer. Hist. Rev., Nov.); H. E. Davis, *Mexican Petroleum Taxes* (*ibid*); Poblette Troncoso, *Le Code Fédéral du Travail au Mexique* (Rev. de l'Amér. Latine, Apr.); *id., L'Influence du Capital Étranger dans le Développement de l'Amérique Latine* (*ibid.*, July).

Document: Mary M. Kenway, ed., *Correspondence between General William Winder and President Monroe* (Hisp. Amer. Hist. Rev., Nov.).

W. S. R.

Contributions to the section of Historical News have been made by Arthur I. Andrews, S. F. Bemis, R. C. Binkley, G. C. Boyce, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, E. N. Curtis, H. N. Fowler, C. M. Frasure, W. T. Laprade, Harold Larson, L. M. Larson, H. S. Lucas, Sidney Painter, M. M. Quaife. W. S. Robertson, Carl Wittke, J. A. Woodburn.